

The Danger at Midday: Death Threats in the Apocalypse(*)

The word μεσουράνημα is used three times in the Apocalypse: the zenith, the point where the sun reaches its highest point; the midday: in 8,13 the seer hears an eagle crying with a loud voice as it flew in mid-heaven, “Woe, woe, woe to those who dwell on the earth”; in 14,6 he sees an angel flying in mid-heaven with an eternal gospel to proclaim to those who dwell on earth...saying with a loud voice: “Fear God and give him glory, for the hour of his judgment has come; and worship him who made heaven and earth, the sea and the fountains of water”(1); and in 19,17 he sees an angel standing in the sun which with a loud voice calls to all the birds that fly in mid-heaven: “Come, gather for the great supper of God, to eat the flesh of kings, the flesh of captains, the flesh of mighty men, the flesh of horses and their riders, and the flesh of all men, both free and slave, both small and great”. The word is thus an indication of time as well as of place and is evidently not insignificant in the scheme of the book. It is the place from where the last and the greatest plagues begin. It is the point in time at which the confession of God as creator of heaven and earth must resound and it is the place from where the birds are summoned from the sky to begin their last meal, the end of the beast and all its followers.

In the study of the Apocalypse there is a discussion about the inquiry into the social setting of the book: are there real death threats or do these exist only in the mind and imagination of the author? L.L. Thompson(2) describes this as a contrast between the position of E. Schüssler Fiorenza and A. Yarbo Collins. While A. Yarbo Collins writes that

(*) Prof. Sjeff van Tilborg passed away on the 22nd of May 2003. The proofs of this article were corrected by his assistant Dr. Patrick Chatelion Counet.

(1) The confession of God as maker of everything often comes back in all sorts of *martyria*: see 4 Macc 11,5; *Mart. Carpi, Papyli et Agathonicae* 9; *Mart. Justini* 1.15; recensio B 2.12; recensio C 2.3; *Mart. Apollonii* 2; *Mart. Pionii* 8.3 and others, see H. MUSURILLO, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (Oxford 1972) 91 n. 3; L. ROBERT, *Le martyre de Pionios, prêtre de Smyrne* (Washington 1994) 70.

(2) *The Book of Revelation. Apocalypse and Empire* (Oxford 1990) 202-210; see also St.J. FRIESEN, *Imperial Cults and the Apocalypse of John*. Reading Revelation in the Ruins (Oxford 2001) 144-151 who quotes these same authors.

Revelation was indeed written in response to a crisis, but one that resulted from the clash between the expectations of John and like-minded Christians and the social reality within which they had to live⁽³⁾,

E. Schüssler Fiorenza thinks that

Like John, Christians of Asia Minor suffered a deep tension between their faith and their experience. They believed in the ultimate power of God and Christ, but at the same time they experienced daily their powerlessness in the face of harassment, oppression, and persecution⁽⁴⁾.

I don't think it is possible to reconstruct from a fictional text — and the Apocalypse is in the NT a fictional text *par excellence* — the historico-sociological setting in which the book would have arisen. The social reality has influenced the thinking and the imagination of the author but in my opinion it is not possible to retrieve this from the text. What is very well possible is to show parallel lines: to make a reconstruction of a historico-sociological reality and parallel to it to show that (parts of) the text of the Apocalypse reflect this reality; that they refer to it within this particular historico-sociological context; that the same type of language is used.

There has always been a big interest in the relationship between the cult of the emperor and the persecution. In the study of the Apocalypse the role of Nero and Domitian in particular has then been examined. Meanwhile it is clear that, aside from the incidental actions against some Christians in Rome, there was no question of State persecution. The actions in Rome had no — or in any case no demonstrable — consequences in the provinces, in Asia Minor in this case⁽⁵⁾.

This may all be true but according to P. Prigent it should not lead to the conclusion that there would not have been any real danger to the life of Christians in the Asia Minor area covered by the Apocalypse:

⁽³⁾ A. YARBO COLLINS, *Crisis and Catharsis* (Philadelphia 1984) 165.

⁽⁴⁾ E. SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA, *Invitation to the Book of Revelation* (Garden City, NY 1981) 28.

⁽⁵⁾ See e.g. E. GRIFFE, *Les persécutions contre les chrétiens aux I^{er} et II^e siècles* (Paris 1967); *Opposition et Résistance à l'Empire d'Auguste à Trajan* (ed. G. ADALBERTO) (Vandoeuvres — Genève 1987); L.L. THOMPSON, *Book of Revelation*, 95-132; B.W. JONES, *The Emperor Domitian* (London — New York 1992); Sh. BARTSCH, *Actors in the Audience*. Theatricality and Doublespeak from Nero to Hadrian (Cambridge, MA 1994); R.A. BAUMAN, *Crime and Punishment in Ancient Rome* (London — New York 1996); B. LEVICK, *Vespasian* (London — New York 1999); FRIESEN, *Imperial Cults and the Apocalypse*, 145-151.

one should note that, while it is true that the book's revelation is a prophetic denunciation of the fundamental incompatibility that exists between the pagan religion on which the Roman empire is based on the one hand and the Christian faith on the other, this does not in any way imply the absence of all risks entailed by faithfulness to the Lord Jesus Christ, risks which are mentioned many times in the book of Revelation, in terms that are barely veiled⁽⁶⁾.

I would like to concur with this grandmaster in the exegesis of the Apocalypse. By making a comparison between what happens at the *munera*, the games which are organized by the rich as φιλοτιμία⁽⁷⁾ and the text of the Apocalypse, I want to show where P. Prigent is right in talking about the risks which in the Apocalypse are mentioned in terms which are barely veiled.

1. The *munera*

The gladiatorial games which are a part of the *munera* enjoy great scholarly interest⁽⁸⁾. Originally these games were connected with the death of an important public figure as tribute to the deceased. At the end of the Republic (through Sulla, Pompey, Caesar and Anthony) they are also put into service in the internal political struggle to win popular

⁽⁶⁾ P. PRIGENT, *Commentary on the Apocalypse of St. John* (Tübingen 2001) 74.

⁽⁷⁾ According to L. ROBERT, *Les gladiateurs dans l'Orient Grec* (Amsterdam 1971) 277-280 the words *munus* and φιλοτιμία become fully synonymous in the course of the second-third century.

⁽⁸⁾ See e.g. A. ROLAND, *Cruelty and Civilization. The Roman Games* (London – New York 1972); A. CAMERON, *Circus Factions. Blues and Greens at Rome and Byzantium* (Oxford 1976); K.M. COLEMAN, "Fatal Charades: Roman Executions Staged as Mythological Enactments", *Journal of Roman Studies* 80 (1990) 44-73; Th. WIEDEMANN, *Emperors and Gladiators* (London – New York 1992); M. CARTMILL, *A View to Death in the Morning. Hunting and Nature through History* (Cambridge, MA 1993); C.A. BARTON, *The Sorrows of the Ancient Romans. The Gladiator and the Monster* (Princeton, NJ 1993); P. PLASS, *The Game of Death in Ancient Rome. Arena Sport and Political Suicide* (Wisconsin – London 1995); D.G. KYLE, *Spectacles of Death in Ancient Rome* (London – New York 1998); F. MEIJER, *Gladiatoren. Volksvermaak in het Colosseum* (Amsterdam 2003). For this paper the book of L. ROBERT, *Les gladiateurs dans l'Orient Grec* is obviously the most important. In citing the inscriptions I write ROBERT + number (= the number that Robert gave to the inscription in his study). When I refer to the pages, I write ROBERT, *Gladiateurs* + number. With the cities from the Apocalypse I have also indicated always the most up-to-date or the first publication. I have completed and corrected the inscriptions of Robert by the texts from the *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (SEG) from 1971-1998.

favor. For this reason they become so important politically that hereafter — starting from and under Augustus — the emperor appropriates the exclusive right to hold these games. No games then are organized which have not been in one way or another approved by the authorities: in Rome by the emperor himself and in the provinces by the local authorities.

In Asia Minor these games — they are called μονομαχία in Greek — are organized specifically by the asiarchs. Many inscriptions have been preserved: inscriptions of honor for the people who have organized them once or several times; reliefs with depictions of what has happened and memorials for the gladiators themselves. Just only for the cities of the Apocalypse some 94 inscriptions are involved. The dating is roughly first to third century; a small minority of these is demonstrably first century; the greater majority is second/third century. A more precise indication is not possible.

What is interesting to note is the fact that in a number of cities of the Apocalypse there was even standard talk of the presence of a school for gladiators (a *familia gladiatorum*; or in Greek a φαμίλια μονομάχων), which implies that there were also barracks, training fields, instructors and attendants.

As usual we find most of the inscriptions in Ephesus. In these texts also the connection between being the asiarch and the organizing of the games is most clearly expressed. At the time of Trajan the *phamilia monomachōn* erects a statue for their asiarch Ti. Kl. Tatianos⁽⁹⁾. This becomes a tradition. In the middle of the second century it is the famous and rich Vedii family which owns a school for gladiators: see the inscription of the *phamilia monomachōn* on the tomb of the Vedii⁽¹⁰⁾; the relief of the gladiator on the tomb of the Vedii⁽¹¹⁾; the mention of the *philoploi philobèdioi*⁽¹²⁾ with next to this the competing group of the *philoplia hierou makellou*⁽¹³⁾; the *monomachoi* of the asiarch Loukios Aufidios Euphèmos⁽¹⁴⁾; and the *phamilia monomachōn* of the asiarch Tib. Ioulios Rhègeinos⁽¹⁵⁾; the asiarch Klaudios Kleoboulos⁽¹⁶⁾ and the asiarch Tib. Klaudios Pankratidès

⁽⁹⁾ *Inscr Eph* IV-1182; V-1620; ROBERT, 204.

⁽¹⁰⁾ ROBERT, 208.

⁽¹¹⁾ ROBERT, 203.

⁽¹²⁾ *Inscr Eph* VII-1-3055; ROBERT, 201 and 202.

⁽¹³⁾ *Inscr Eph* VI-2226; ROBERT, 202.

⁽¹⁴⁾ *Inscr Eph* IV-1171; see also IV-1172; 1173.

⁽¹⁵⁾ *Inscr Eph* V-1621; ROBERT, 205.

⁽¹⁶⁾ *SEG* 1992 nr 1031.

Attikos⁽¹⁷⁾. In Pergamum there is the very early inscription of Romanus Montanus (from the time of Tiberius) who is *procurator Augusti familiae gladiatorum*, that is to say, the procurator of a gladiatorial school of the emperor⁽¹⁸⁾. And in Smyrna the asiarch Kl. Timoon is honored by his *phamilia monomachōn*⁽¹⁹⁾.

It should be clear that the gladiatorial games were also strongly present in the so-called Apocalypse area. The following is important: from the time of Augustus (but actually already earlier) these gladiatorial games are often connected with two other forms of amusement which originally had nothing to do with the *munera*, namely 1) in the morning the *venationes ad matutinum* which consisted of showing all sorts of wild and exotic animals; and of the θηριομαχία: the fights of animals among themselves and the fight of human beings with animals; and 2) in the midday intermission, the public execution of criminals of low social status (the *noxii, cruciarii*) who had been condemned *ad bestias* or *ad flammas*.

It is particularly these two forms of amusement as parts of the *munera* which are relevant to this paper. So I go into it more explicitly.

2. Ad *matutinum*

a) Description

The competition between the emperor and his predecessor(s) provided the needed variation. At the first part of the *venationes* one could vary the number and sort of animals. Pompey organized games, for example, with 20 elephants, 600 lions, 410 leopards, monkeys, lynxes and the first rhinoceros. Caesar surprised his public with giraffes. And in the *Res Gestae*, Augustus boasts of the cumulative total of 3.500 animals slaughtered in the various *venationes* for the Roman people⁽²⁰⁾.

Two types of fights are organized: fights between the animals themselves: lions, leopards, wild boars, bears, crocodiles and rhinoceros against bulls, deer, sea lions, dolphins, elephants and giraffes; and the fight between human beings and animals: bullfighting was an old custom but now combined with the fight between the *bestiarius*, an armed man, and a bear, leopard and lion.

⁽¹⁷⁾ *Inscr Eph* VII-2-4346.

⁽¹⁸⁾ *CIL* III 14192; ROBERT, 258.

⁽¹⁹⁾ *Inscr Smyrna* 842; ROBERT, 225.

⁽²⁰⁾ Cf. WIEDEMANN, *Emperors and Gladiators*, 60; MEIJER, *Gladiatoren*, 43-47.

What goings-on there were is beautiful to read in a poem from the *Anthologia Graeca*:

A man fixed a pole on the ground,
And throwing himself into the air made a somersault,
And with his nimble feet passed over the back of the beast
That was rushing at him.
It failed to catch him;
The people applauded loudly
And the man escaped (IX. 53).

If it is correct, it is about trained people who have a good chance of surviving at the risk of their own lives. Different terms are used: προκυνηγία (the show of the animals before they are slaughtered); κυνηγία or κυνηγεσία (the hunt after the animals by trained animal hunters), ταυρομαχία (the bullfight), ταυροβολία (the ritual sacrifice of a bull) and θηριομαχία the collective name for all sorts of fights: those between animal and human being (trained or not; armed or not) and those between animal and animal.

There are all sorts of combinations made: In Ancyra from the time of Tiberius a long list of benefactors has been preserved who besides other benefactions for the city have also taken care of the gladiatorial games: the son of Brigatos took care of a feast with 30 pairs of gladiators and a hunting party after bulls and wild beasts; Rufus, of a κυνήγιον; [...]llios, of a gladiatorial fight with 25 pairs of gladiators; Pylaimenès is mentioned three times: as organizer of a bullfight and a κυνήγιον; later once more as organizer of a bullfight combined with 50 pairs of gladiators; and a couple of years later once again as organizer of a gladiatorial fight with 30 pairs of gladiators⁽²¹⁾; In Pinara a man is honored who organized just about everything in different cities of Lycia: θηριομαχία, ταυρομαχία, κυνηγεσία, προκυνηγία, and ταυροβολία⁽²²⁾. In Xanthos someone has organized προκυνηγία, ταυρομαχία and θηριομαχία in the temple of Leto (ROBERT, 105); in Telmessos: μονομαχία and θηριομαχία (ROBERT, 108); in Oinoanda: κυνηγεσία, θηριομαχία and μονομαχία (ROBERT, 113; 113a) etc.

Thus there is often the combination of the μονομαχία with another form of amusement, but not always. Sometimes only a θηριομαχία is organized.

⁽²¹⁾ ROBERT, 86

⁽²²⁾ ROBERT, 104

In the area that the Apocalypse covers, we find the same pattern. The following inscriptions are relevant:

In Pergamum:

- mention of bullfights over two days (*Inscr. Perg.*, 523; ROBERT, 265);

- depiction of a man with a whip; a wild animal jumping up against him (*Alt. Pergamon, Sculptures*, 342; ROBERT, 264).

In Sardis:

- a relief with a horseman who hunts after animals (BUCKLER, *Sardis*, 162; ROBERT, 137);

- over three days there were κυνηγεσία: a number of animals depicted: a bull, deer, wolves(?) (BUCKLER, *Sardis*, 82; ROBERT, 138).

In Smyrna:

- over three days there were κυνηγεσία: on the depiction a bull is attacked by a bear; a beast on the ground with the legs up; a bull which gets round its neck a collar tied by a man (*Inscr Smyrna*, 863; ROBERT, 233);

- a *bestiarius* who is on a hunt with a pickaxe; there is an indication of how many beasts have been killed; the number itself has been lost (*Inscr Smyrna*, 837; ROBERT, 230);

- a *bestiarius* who attacks a bull with a knife; there is an indication of how many beasts have been killed; the number itself has been lost (*Inscr Smyrna*, 838; ROBERT, 229);

- a bullfight over two days; depiction of the bullfight (*Inscr Smyrna*, 835; ROBERT, 234);

- depiction of fights between animals (ROBERT, 236).

In Ephesus:

- in the time of Trajan Ti. Fl. Montanos is honored among other things because of his κυνηγεσία and μονομαχία (*Inscr Eph VI-2061.2*; ROBERT, 198);

- M. Aur. Mindos Mattidianos is honored among other things because he caused 25 wild animals from Libya to be killed (ζῶα λιβυκά) (*Inscr Eph III-627*; VII-1-3056; ROBERT, 198);

- Aurelius [] in the course of 13 days made wild animals from Lybia (ζῶα λιβυκά) to be killed (*Inscr Eph VII-1-3071*; ROBERT, 199);

- Aurelius Dafnos in the course of 13 days made wild animals from Libya (ζῶα λιβυκά) to be killed (*Inscr Eph VII-1-3070*; ROBERT, 200);

- depiction with four strips: limb of a human being; a lion roars over an armed man; lion eats his thigh; in the fourth block: ἀνιρέθη (= carried off to be buried) (ROBERT, 219).

In Philadelphia:

– combat between gladiator (here with a stick) and animal in which one of them has to die (ζυγόν απότομον) (*IGR* IV 1632; ROBERT, 139).

b) The parallel with the Apocalypse

Further on in this paper still a number of other aspects come up for discussion, but to begin with, there is the most obvious phenomenon — which in the exegesis of the Apocalypse, in so far as I can see it, actually never comes up⁽²³⁾. More than Ezekiel, and even more than Daniel — the great sources of inspiration of the author of the Apocalypse — the book of the Apocalypse has become a book about beasts. There are 17 different beasts mentioned. A distinction in three groups seems to me appropriate.

The first group involves animals which play a subordinate role within the plot of the narrative: grasshoppers (9,3.7), frogs (16,13), scorpions (9,3.5.10), the sheep of Babylon (18,13) and dogs (22,15); and a number of times when horses are mentioned (9,7.9.17.19; 14,20; 18,13; 19,18).

The second group of animals takes up a middle position. They are directly in the service of the four animals (the lamb, the dragon, the beast out of the sea and the beast out of the land) which determine the plot of the story:

– the four ζῷα (usually translated with ‘the living creatures’ but against the background of the κυνηγεσία one can better translate with ‘wild beasts’): a combination of four animals in which the first beast looks like a lion, the second like a young bull, the third like a human being and the fourth like an eagle. They are as a unity in the service of the lamb that is a lion (4,6-9; 5,6-14; 6,1-7; 7,11; 14,3; 15,7; 19,4);

– the eagle as messenger of the three-fold woe (8,13) and as help of the pregnant woman (12,14);

– the horses which carry the avenging angels (6,2-8; 19,14) but

⁽²³⁾ This has to do with the investigation of intertextuality. One assumes that once the relation with the texts of Ezekiel and Daniel has been shown, the text would have been explained. Up to a certain point that is of course true, but still I think that an intertextual relationship does not cancel or diminish the power of the word or the expression to refer to current events. Thus when in 13, 2 the beast out of the sea is described as a beast that looks like a leopard, a bear and a lion there is indeed an intertextual reference to Dan 7, 4-6, but leopards, bears and lions continue to be naturally also the most exciting and dangerous beasts in the κυνηγεσία.

especially also the horse that carries the white rider who is the lamb, the word of God (19,11.19.21);

– and the birds which are invited to eat the flesh of the conquered (19,17-21).

The third and last group involves the four animals which carry the plot: the lamb which is a lion; the red dragon, the beast out of the sea and the beast out of the land. A few matters are important so as to be noted:

(1) Against the background of the curiosity about exotic animals which emerges from the lavish organization of the *κονηγεσία*⁽²⁴⁾, the composite character of these animals is interesting. The lamb has 7 horns and 7 eyes (5,6) and is equated with a lion (the lion of the tribe of Juda: 5,5); it is a heavenly figure which stands at the inception of the struggle against the dragon and its followers and for this reason gets heavenly praise and honor; in c. 14, after the introduction of the beasts in c.12 and 13, the vision is told of the lamb who stands together with his 144.000 followers on Mt. Zion; in 17,14 the battle is announced and the victory; in the last chapters the metaphor changes: the lamb changes into a rider on a white horse (19,11-16) and the lamb (21,9) gets a bride and is thus himself a sort of bridegroom. The dragon has 7 heads and 10 horns with a serpentine tail (12,3); he was thrown out of heaven and is now at war with the offspring of the woman (12,13-17). He is also called ‘serpent’ and ‘the ancient serpent’ (12,9.14.15; 20,2). He is the most powerful figure but in the end he also shall taste defeat⁽²⁵⁾. The beast out of the sea has also 7 heads and 10 horns; it is also different because it has the body of a leopard, the feet of a bear and the mouth of a lion (13,1-2); perhaps this is also the beast that kills the two witnesses (11,7) and on which the whore of Babylon sits (17,3). The fourth beast is the beast out of the earth; it has 2 horns and the voice of a dragon (13,11); because of its 2 horns it looks like a lamb (13,11). It is the most active beast: it performs signs; it makes the other beast speak; it gives people a mark on the forehead or on the right hand, a mark that has positive and negative effects. Because of these activities he is called ‘false prophet’ (16,13; 19,20; 20,10).

⁽²⁴⁾ For a description of the fascination of the Romans for the monster, see the second part of C.A. Barton’s study, *The Gladiator and the Monster*, 85-189.

⁽²⁵⁾ Interesting still is also the fact that *Δράκων* is also a name of gladiators, see in Miletus (*CIG* 2898; ROBERT, 178) and in Ephesus, a relief with the depiction of two combatting gladiators among which the names *Ἀστροποῖος* and *Δράκων* (ROBERT, 209).

(2) All four are fantastic beings to see, dangerous, powerful, strong. Against the background of the hunting games as I have described them until now, the Apocalypse is the story of one big *θηριομαχία*, the fight of one animal against other animals, here in this case the fight of the Lamb that is a Lion against the Dragon and his Beasts. Eventually it ends up in a *κυνηγεσία*: the fight of the rider on the white horse against the Beast and the kings, ending in a banquet for the birds out of the sky which may feast on the flesh of kings, the flesh of captains, the flesh of mighty men, the flesh of horses and their riders, and the flesh of all men (19,11-21).

(3) Because it is about a war (19,19) perhaps we are supposed to think of the staged battles like those organized by many emperors: the *naumachia* which were played from the time of Caesar until Trajan: sea battles imitated in the amphitheatres in which thousands of dead fell (one time 6.000 soldiers under Julius Caesar; 3.000 under Augustus; 19.000 under Claudius; etc); or better still the re-enacted wars just like what Claudius did on the Campus Martius:

He (= Claudius) gave representations in the Campus Martius of the storming and sacking of a town in the manner of real warfare, as well as of the surrender of the kings of the Britons, and presided clad in a general's cloak (Suetonius, *Claudius* 21.6) ⁽²⁶⁾

or what Josephus tells about Titus regarding the fate of the Jewish war prisoners after the fall of Jerusalem:

Titus passed to Caesarea Philippi where he remained for a considerable time, exhibiting all kinds of spectacles. Here many of the prisoners perished, some being thrown to wild beasts, others compelled in opposing masses to engage one another in combat (*BJ* VII. 23-25).

The final conflict in the book of the Apocalypse is a muddled combat between the beasts and the heavenly and earthly armies. The result is one great mass of corpses, killed by fire or with the sword. In the last case the corpses are food for the birds ⁽²⁷⁾, the *carnarium*, an extraordinary punishment because then no proper burial is possible anymore.

⁽²⁶⁾ See COLEMAN, "Fatal Charades", 70-73

⁽²⁷⁾ What happens here once again is that an intertextual cross-reference (to Ez 39,17-21) and a reference to actual reality go hand in hand. See KYLE, *Spectacles of Death*, 130-132; 156-171 about the clearing away of the people who were killed in the arena: as feed for the beasts, birds and dogs; *ad flammās* and in the river.

3. *You will face hardship for ten days (Rev 2,10)*

As transition from the discussion of what happens *ad matutinum* and afterwards at the midday intermission, I would like to show that the paralleling of the Apocalypse text with the gladiatorial games can perhaps explain an expression which until now remains rather unexplained in the exegesis. It is about the expression ἐξετε θλίψιν ἡμερῶν δέκα in the letter to the angel of the church in Smyrna (2,10). I would like to cite the three most recent commentaries. D. Aune writes about this part of the verse:

The phrase “ten days” is used for an undefined but relatively short period of time, perhaps it is the sum of the fingers of both hands (Gen 24:55; Num 11:19; Neh 5:18; Jer 42:7; Dan 1:12-15); *m* ‘Abot 5:1-6 contains a list of ten things of various kinds. Ten can also function as a number signifying completeness⁽²⁸⁾.

R.H. Mounce writes:

Believers at Smyrna (or at least some of them) are to suffer persecution for ten days (or “within ten days”). Opinions vary about the time intended. Most view the ten days as a round number indicating a short period of time, but others hold it to be a prolonged but definitively limited period. The latter interpretation is more in keeping with the seriousness of the impending crisis⁽²⁹⁾

P. Prigent summarizes this and then expresses his own preference for an intertextual relationship with the text of Daniel:

The number is surprising. It is generally explained as an assertion that the persecution was limited by God. Ten would thus be a round number that is fitting for this intention. There are indeed several examples of a similar usage of this number in the OT, such as the following: “They tempted me ten times without obeying my voice”, says God in speaking of the rebellious Hebrews (Num 14:22). In this case ten signifies “many times”. And yet one should note, as does Kraft, that we possess in the OT a precise text which might have been present in the mind of the author when he spoke of ten days of tribulation, namely Dan 1: 12,14, which speaks of the days during which the Hebrew youth abstain from the impure food served at the table of King Nebuchadnezzar. The testing ends in a conclusive manner: God rewards their faithfulness and they endure the period of fasting with no ill effects⁽³⁰⁾.

⁽²⁸⁾ D.A. AUNE, *Revelation 1–5* (WBC; Dallas, TX 1997) 166.

⁽²⁹⁾ R.H. MOUNCE, *The Book of Revelation* (Grand Rapids, MI 1998) 76.

⁽³⁰⁾ PRIGENT, *Commentary*, 168-169.

Because a really good intertextual reference is not possible, everyone is rather perplexed. The ten days in the Apocalypse have obviously nothing to do with the ten fingers of the hand or with the 10 days of fasting; and is '10 days' now a short (Aune) or a long (Mounce) time? Apparently the text itself does not make this really clear.

Still forgoing the aspect of the persecution — about which in a little while —, I would like first to concentrate on the time indication as such: ten days — it becomes suspenseful. I think namely that the expression can be related to the number of days that the *μονομαχία* lasts. In the preceding I have already cited different inscriptions where the number of days of the games had been reported. I am giving now the fuller list:

- 2 days in Antioch of Pisidia⁽³¹⁾; Pergamum⁽³²⁾ and Smyrna⁽³³⁾;
- 3 days in Thessalonica⁽³⁴⁾; in a first century inscription in Magnesia-on-Meander⁽³⁵⁾; in Sardis⁽³⁶⁾; Smyrna⁽³⁷⁾ and Klaudioupolis⁽³⁸⁾;
- 4 days in Gortyne (ROBERT, 63) and Sagalassos (ROBERT, 97);
- 5 days in Miletus (SEG 1985 nr 1132) and in Ephesus (*Inscr Eph* III-627; VII-1-3056; ROBERT, 198);
- 6 days in Tomi (ROBERT, 43)
- 8 days in Antioch of Pisidia (ROBERT, 92)
- 12 days in Miletus (ROBERT, 192; in this same inscription it is also said that the man has organized *θεωρία* for 10 days).
- 13 days in Ephesus (*Inscr Eph* VII-1-3070; 3071; ROBERT, 199, 200)⁽³⁹⁾.

The 10 days from the Apocalypse-text fit beautifully in the list. Most exegetes also assume a connection with some kind of persecution. That seems correct, because the text says:

⁽³¹⁾ ROBERT, 94.

⁽³²⁾ *Inscr Perg* 523; ROBERT, 265.

⁽³³⁾ *Inscr Smyrna* 835, ROBERT, 234; I leave out ROBERT, 38 (Serdica) and 39 (Nikopolis), because the time determination is there only as corrections by Robert himself.

⁽³⁴⁾ ROBERT, 11.

⁽³⁵⁾ *Inscr Magn* 163; ROBERT, 152.

⁽³⁶⁾ BUCKLER, *Sardes* 82; ROBERT, 138.

⁽³⁷⁾ *Inscr Smyrna* 863; ROBERT, 233.

⁽³⁸⁾ SEG 1989, nr 1339.

⁽³⁹⁾ The 51 days which are mentioned in an inscription from Ancyra (ROBERT, 87) are probably the totality of his whole career and not one single *munus*.

Do not fear what you are about to suffer. Behold, the devil is about to throw some of you into prison, that you may be tested, and for ten days you will have tribulation. Be faithful unto death, and I will give you the crown of life (3,10).

The text makes a combination of suffering, imprisonment, 10 days of hardship, death threat and crowning. It is a cluster of successive happenings which is to be understood from what happens at the midday intermission at the *munera*: namely the public execution of convicts of low social status who had been condemned *ad bestias*, *ad flammam* (or *ad gladium*).

For this to be understood, I have first to go still more extensively into what we know of what happens during this midday break.

4. The *meridiani*

a) Description

I would like to begin with the expressive description of it which is to be found in Seneca, *Epistulae Morales ad Lucilium* 7:

By chance I attended a mid-day exhibition, expecting some fun, wit, and relaxation, — an exhibition at which men's eyes have respite from the slaughter of their fellow-men. But it was quite the reverse. The previous combats were the essence of compassion; but now all trifling is put aside and it is pure murder. The men have no defensive armour. They are exposed to blows at all points, and no one ever strikes in vain. Many persons prefer this programme to the usual pairs and to the bouts "by requests". Of course they do; there is no helmet or shield to deflect the weapon. What is the need of defensive armour, or of skill? All these mean delaying death. In the morning they throw men to the lions and the bears; at noon, they throw them to the spectators. The spectators demand that the slayer shall face the man who is to slay him in his turn; and they always reserve the latest conqueror for another butchering. The outcome of every fight is death, and the means are fire and sword. This sort of things goes on while the arena is empty. You may retort: "But he was a highway robber; he killed a man!" And what of it... In the morning they cried 'Kill him! Lash him! Burn him...and when the games stop for the intermission, they announce: 'A little throat-cutting in the meantime, so that there may still be something going on!' ⁽⁴⁰⁾

The description of Seneca is not quite typical. What it is about here is pretty well a man-to-man fight in which the condemned, because he is unarmed, does not have the ghost of a chance. From mosaics and a

⁽⁴⁰⁾ See especially BARTON, *The Gladiator and the Monster*, 16-25.

number of reliefs it is clear that it is usually not a fight between human beings but a combat between a beast (lion, panther, bear, wild boar) and a human being, in this case the condemned (usually men but sometimes also a woman). There is a sort of transition between the last part of the *venationes* and what the midday intermission has to offer. In the Zliten mosaic from Libya that is part of the world heritage⁽⁴¹⁾, all other sorts of fights are depicted beside the pairs of fighting gladiators: a naked man who is pushed forward on a cart towards a leopard which attacks him; a man who hunts deer; a man who is threatened by a bear; a man with a deer that is itself attacked by a wolf (?); a horse that lies wounded on the ground; a fight between a bear and a bull spurred on by a man with a long stick; a naked woman who is beaten with a whip towards a lion ...

There are also a few reliefs that have been preserved from the area covered by the Apocalypse:

– from Smyrna a relief on which three strips stand one above the other: on the topmost and the middle two condemned are depicted with a rope around the neck; except for a pubic apron they are naked; they are ushered into the arena by a man wearing a tunic; on the undermost frame animals are depicted: a lion; and an ibex which is attacked by a wild boar⁽⁴²⁾.

– from Ephesus a relief on which a naked and a manacled woman is attacked by a wild animal; the man at the left is the *bestiarius*; on the background the contours of the arena are depicted⁽⁴³⁾.

Because it is about the condemned, the intention is to aggravate dying itself: *mors turpissima*. In the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius one can see how gruesome fantasy and reality are interchanged. A number of men want to take revenge on a girl who has cheated them:

One advised that the girl be burned alive; a second exhorted that she be thrown to the beasts; a third advocated that she be nailed to a cross; a fourth recommended that she be torn to pieces on the rack...A fifth

⁽⁴¹⁾ G. VILLE, a great expert of the North African archeology dates the mosaic by the clothes of the gladiators as end of the first century /beginning of the second century, see “Essai de datation de la mosaïque des gladiateurs de Zliten”, *La Mosaïque Gréco-Romaine* (ed. M.G. PICARD – M.H. STERN) (Paris 1965) 147-155.

⁽⁴²⁾ For a depiction, see S. REINACH, *Répertoire de Reliefs Grecs et Romains* (Paris 1912) II, 526, n. 2; for the description ROBERT, 235.

⁽⁴³⁾ For a depiction, see J. KEIL, *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes* 11 (1908) 148, Beiblatt, fig. 100; for the description ROBERT, 222.

sees the possibility of a combination (of punishments). They would have to kill an ass and then clean out all the guts. Strip the girl...and sew her up inside his belly so that only her face protrudes...the ass will die, as he has long deserved; the girl will endure the bites of beasts when the worms lacerate her limbs, the scorching of fire when the sun scorches the ass's belly with its excessive heat, and the agony of the cross when the dogs and vultures draw out her very guts (*Met.* 6,31-32).

This is an imaginary description but one that probably describes precisely how people look at these spectacles. Usually it involves individual events, the death of a pair of men, but in Josephus we also find descriptions of mass annihilations, namely those of Jewish captives after the Jewish war. I have already cited the text where it is said that Titus makes the Jewish captives re-enact a battle as a spectacle. A bit further on in the story of Josephus he relates:

during his stay at Caesarea, Titus celebrated his brother's birthday with great splendour, reserving in his honour for this festival much of the punishment of his Jewish captives. For the number of those destroyed *in contests with wild beasts or with one another or in the flames* exceeded two thousand five hundred. Yet to the Romans, notwithstanding the myriad forms in which their victims perished, all this seemed too light a penalty. After this Caesar passed to Berytus, a city of Phoenicia and a Roman colony. Here he made a longer sojourn, displaying still greater magnificence on the occasion of his father's birthday, both in the costliness of the spectacles and in the ingenuity of the various other items of expenditure. Multitudes of captives perished in the same manner as before (*BJ* VII.37-40).

For the rest Trajan does the same thing with thousands of captive Daci. J. Bennett writes about the second Dacian games with reference to the victory in the second Dacian war and the death of Decebalus:

Trajan offered 332.5 gladiatorial pairs in 2 *munera*, the second of 12 days. A third *munus*, with 340 pairs lasted 13 days, and, 1 November 109, not less than 117 days were devoted to the main series of displays, involving 4.941.5 gladiatorial pairs and 11.000 animals displayed and killed. Finally, on 11 November 109, Trajan inaugurated a *naumachia*, a structure devoted to mock sea-battles, and exhibited a further 127.5 pairs over a period of 6 days, completing the celebrations for the conquest of Dacia on 24 November 109⁽⁴⁴⁾.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ J. BENNETT, *Trajan: Optimus Princeps. A Life and Times* (London – New York 1997). On pp. 96-97 about the triumph after the first Dacian war in the year 102/103 and on pp. 101-103 about the second triumph after the second Dacian war. The citation is on p. 102.

There is a social demand and so there arises even a form of trade in *noxii* who can be used as *meridiani* in the midday intermission. Among other things a copy was found in Sardis of a senate decree from 177 about these *damnati*. The State is prepared to deliver them cheap, but the buyers have to guarantee that they are killed within a certain deadline⁽⁴⁵⁾. It is a strange trade. It is also precisely the time in which the first Acts of the Christian martyrs are dated. Without any doubt these martyrs were, to the amazement of the spectators, in a strange way willing *meridiani*.

The last phase of the combat is death: dying or (otherwise) killing. The common words ἀποθνήσκω and ἀποκτείνω are used, but also the special word σφάζω: to slaughter, to kill, to sacrifice. It is a special word because, like a few other words, it is open to a double meaning. It is a LXX word. There it is used 84 times (plus still 24 times the word σφαγή and 5 times the word σφάγιον)⁽⁴⁶⁾ and is more properly dealt with in a twofold context: 1) in the sacrifice of the animal for slaughter, e.g. 30 times in Leviticus (see 1,5.11; 3,2.8.13; 4,4.15.24.29.33 etc.), but also with the sacrifice of Isaac (Gen 22,10). And 2) in a war context, in the massacre of people: Elijah who causes the prophets of Baal to be massacred (1 Kgs 18,40); the 70 princes of Ahab who are massacred at the throne succession (2 Kgs 10,7), the sword of God which is sharpened for the slaughter (Ez 1,15) etc. and especially in the context of the Maccabean wars (1 Macc 1,2; 2,24; 2 Macc 5,24; 8,24; 10,37; 12,26; 4 Macc 2,19).

The word σφάζω, however, is also used in a typical manner within the context of gladiators. I give a number of relevant texts:

– in an inscription from Hierapolis⁽⁴⁷⁾ in a fourfold strip four names at the right side are still legible. One must assume that still four other names would be at the left side. It is then about four gladiatorial pairs whose outcome was all the time written down:

- μὲν Βικτωρ ἀπέθανον
[Με]λέαγρος ἐσφ[άγη]
- νος Ἰνγέννης ἐσφ[άγη]
Ἀντιοχιανός ἐσφ[άγη]

⁽⁴⁵⁾ *Insc Sardis* 16; see for commentary KYLE, *Spectacles of Death* 84, 94; and MEIJER, *Gladiatoren*, 85-91; 147-157.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Cf. the statistics in J. LUST – E. EYNIKEL – K. HAUSPIE, *A Greek-English Lexicon on the Septuagint* (Stuttgart 1996) II, 465.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ *Altertümer von Hierapolis* 62.63; ROBERT, 122

That is to say: with the first pair both died, but not during the competition. With the others one must assume that the one gladiator has won (those names have to be supplemented with ἐνίκη) and the other has lost. For this last one the verb σφάζω is used.

– On a relief from Hierapolis there is a lying gladiator; next to his head is written: ἐσφάγη⁽⁴⁸⁾.

– In an inscription from Halicarnassus⁽⁴⁹⁾ in the reconstruction of Robert are inscribed on an architrave the names of a pair of gladiators who at the inauguration of the Nemeseion have engaged in combat in the amphitheatre:

Jason, the son of Nicanor, has inaugurated the Nemeseion. The murmillo (= a certain type of gladiator) Smaragdus of Asia who had won 5 times and who had received a crown 5 times, has won (ἐνίκη); and the thrax (= a certain type of gladiator) Strēnos of Asia who had won once and had received a crown once was killed off (ἐσφάγη).

– Of another inscription from Halicarnassus (Robert, 182) the following words still survive: [ΕΣ]ΦΑΓΕΝΤΩΝ [ΤΕ]ΣΣΑΡΩΝ, i.e., there are 4 gladiators killed.

Also within the Apocalypse area a pair of inscriptions have been preserved which also use this word:

– In Smyrna⁽⁵⁰⁾, a relief on which a bullfight was depicted: a bull in a fight with a *bestiarius*, with the word σφακτά under it and a relief of a *bestiarius*⁽⁵¹⁾ who is hunting with a pickaxe, and under it the words -γιου σφακτά.

– In Ephesus⁽⁵²⁾ Aurelius made over a period of 13 days 39 gladiators to fight to the death and he let wild animals from Libya (ζῶα Λιβυκά) be killed (ἀποσφάζαντος) and Aurelius Dafnos⁽⁵³⁾ made over a period of 13 days 39 gladiators fight to the death and he let wild animals from Libya (ζῶα Λιβυκά) be killed (ἀποσφάζαντα).

b) Ten days of hardship and the crown of life (Rev 2,10)

Coming back to the letter to the angel from Smyrna, the sentences about suffering, captivity, the ten days of hardship and the crown of life are perhaps now better to understood. They are all motifs that play

⁽⁴⁸⁾ SEG 1996 nr 1664.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ CIG 2662; ROBERT, 180.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Inscr Smyrna 838; ROBERT, 229

⁽⁵¹⁾ Inscr Smyrna 837; ROBERT, 230

⁽⁵²⁾ Inscr Eph VII-1-3071; ROBERT, 199

⁽⁵³⁾ Inscr Eph VII-1-3072; ROBERT, 200.

a role in the days-long gladiatorial games in which also the *damnati* are ‘cleared away’ — they who have been condemned to death and who sit in prison until a good occasion comes up to execute them in public. The ten days for which the feast lasts are for this reason a θλῖψις, the real possibility to be killed: be faithful unto death. Then you shall receive the ‘crown of life’. Opposite death stands life. The crown at issue here is not ‘the crown’ that people receive in a competition — as victors in games — as is often said in commentaries⁽⁵⁴⁾, but, parallel to other motifs from the gladiators’ world, the crown which a gladiator gets, if he wins, i.e. stays alive. A gladiator gets a crown on the occasion of a special victory. It is an extraordinary honor and on a number of gravestones this is also reported with pride: see, for example, the depiction of 12 crowns, on the gravestone of the *primuspalus* Dionysios in Philadelphia⁽⁵⁵⁾; the epigram of Stephanos in Hierapolis who says about himself that he is δέκατον στεφθεΐς⁽⁵⁶⁾; the 8 crowns on the gravestone of the gladiator Stephanos in Philadelphia⁽⁵⁷⁾; the 6 crowns on a gravestone in Hierapolis⁽⁵⁸⁾; and the 5 crowns on a gravestone of the gladiator in Pergamum⁽⁵⁹⁾: the crown of life is the crown which guarantees life.

c) Being slaughtered and the victory

In a pair of curious places the author of the Apocalypse uses the word σφάζομαι (in the passive sense) in combination with the word νικῶω, namely with the Lamb, with the souls under the altar and with the beast out of the sea.

It is said about the Lamb that it is ὡς ἐσφαγμένον (5,6); τό ἐσφαγμένον (5,12; 13,8) or ὅτι ἐσφάγης (5,9). From the context it is shown that with this addition the Lamb is described as an animal that was sacrificed. In itself it is outside the context of the gladiatorial games. Still this is not absent, because a couple of times there is also a combination made with ‘triumphing’: in 5,5 (in connection with 5,6): “Lo, the Lion of the tribe of Judah *has triumphed*” (ἐνίκησεν) and in 17,14: “they will make war on the Lamb, and the Lamb *will conquer* (νικήσει) them, for he is Lord of lords and King of kings”. Being

⁽⁵⁴⁾ See ALLO, 25-27; CHARLES, 58; SWETE, 33; HEMER, 70-76; AUNE, 166-167; MOUNCE, 76.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ ROBERT, 145.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ *Altertümer von Hierapolis*, 205; ROBERT, 124.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ ROBERT, 141

⁽⁵⁸⁾ SEG 1996 nr 1668.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ ROBERT, 261

slaughtered is undergoing death; winning is inflicting death on the other party and oneself staying alive.

The followers of the Lamb undergo what has happened to the Lamb and do what he has done. With them too is at play this same combination of 'being slaughtered' and 'conquering'. At the opening of the fifth seal it is said there: "I saw under the altar the souls of those who had been slain (τῶν ἐσφαγμένων) for the word of God and for the witness they had borne" (6,9) — who must wait until the number of their brothers who like them (= in the same manner as they?) will be killed is complete. These are presumably the same people as those who are spoken about in the downfall of Babylon: "And in her (= Babylon) was found the blood of prophets and saints, and of all who have been slain (τῶν ἐσφαγμένων) on earth" (18,24). The 'victory' which these people have achieved, is put into words in two other texts: in the ode to the heavenly victory over the red dragon, in 12,11: "And they have conquered (ἐνίκησαν) by the blood of the Lamb and by the word of their testimony for they loved not their lives even unto death"; and just before the appearance of the 7 angels with the last 7 plagues: the victors, as witnesses of these plagues, are present beside the sea of glass mingled with fire to sing the victory song of Moses because they, like Moses and his people, have been saved from destruction: "Those who had conquered (τούς νικῶντας) the beast and its image and the number of its name" (15,2). In a complete reversal of values which are current within the gladiatorial fight, the death which is inflicted with violence is the victory over the killers.

Still for the third time the pair σφάζομαι and νικάω is used, but this time more directly in connection with what happens there in the θηριομαχία. It is about the beast out of the sea that has seven heads and ten horns. "One of its heads seemed to have a mortal wound (ὥς ἐσφαγμένον εἰς θάνατον), but its mortal wound was healed" (15,3.12). It looks just like what happens during a fight between human being and animal or between one animal and another animal. In view of 15,14 the first is more probably the case: "the beast which was wounded *by the sword* and yet lived". Combat has already been engaged in, and with a sword, but the fight is not yet decided. The beast is, in spite of the wound, at first a winner: it conquers (νικήσει) and kills the two witnesses (11,7); and it is allowed to make war on the saints and to conquer (νικήσαι) them (13,7); but in the end it goes to perdition (17,8); the lamb shall conquer the ten heads which are ten kings (νικήσει) (17,14); and in the final combat, the beast itself shall

now be caught by the rider on the white horse (ἐπιόσθη) and together with the beast out of the earth thrown still alive into the lake of fire that burns with sulphur (19,20).

It is clear that this entire motif runs parallel with the world of the *munera* in which one fights to win, because otherwise death is the consequence. Victory is life; defeat is death. It is realistic language only with 'the people who are slaughtered'. The rest is figurative-imaginary. But with the ἐσφαγμένοι it is about real, existing people: about presumably small groups of people who are executed individually in public *ad bestias* or *ad flammās* in the midday intermission of the big, festive city *munera*, in order to be 'finished off' afterwards with a sword, to be carried off with iron hooks in order to be burned or thrown away as feed for the birds and the dogs. For the spectators of the spectacles these people were the losers, perhaps the victims. The Apocalypse is a book that in imitation of the Jewish martyria⁽⁶⁰⁾ has assisted in ideologically changing into a victory that which is for the affected people a painful death. That is necessary, because the author foresees that the threat with such sort of death will continue to apply also for the future: "until the number of their fellow servants and their brethren should be completed, who were to be killed as they themselves had been" (6,11).

d) Two other imaginary fights

Beside the final θηριομαχία in 19,11-21 which I have already pointed out at different times, there are, finally, still two other imaginary descriptions of θηριομαχία: one with a fatal outcome and one where the fight remains still undecided.

In the vision of the two witnesses appears the beast that ascends from the bottomless pit as the great opponent (11,7-10). The beast is presumably the same as the beast that is described in 13,1-8. It bears then the characteristics of the beasts which are used as θηρία in the *munera*: the leopard, the bear and the lion⁽⁶¹⁾. In spite of their great magical talents, the two witnesses are really no match for the beast.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ See *Die Entstehung der jüdischen Martyrologie* (eds. J.W. VAN HENTEN – B. DEHANDSCHUTTER a.o.) (Leiden 1989).

⁽⁶¹⁾ At one time a combination of precisely these animals appears in the inscriptions, namely in an inscription from Sagalossos, ROBERT, 98; separately the beasts appear constantly in all sorts of inscriptions, reliefs and other depictions. See also note 23 about the going hand in hand of the reference to Dan 7,4-6 and the reference to the *munera*.

There is even no talk of any form of resistance. In a fast succession of verbs, it states there: "he will make war upon them and conquer them and kill them" (11,7). The fate of the bodies prefigures or predicts⁽⁶²⁾ the fate that befalls the bodies of the people who are killed in the midday intermission of the *munera*. There is no burial. On the contrary, the burial is denied. The people are even happy when they see the bodies lying. After this the possible comparison between what happens with the bodies of the two witnesses and with the bodies of the ordinary *damnati* stops. The two witnesses, like Elijah and Moses, and like Jesus, accompanied by cosmic happenings are taken into heaven. With the (Christian) *damnati* one can hope for and believe in this, but in any case cannot see.

With chapter 12 (vv. 13-17) we find ourselves totally in the land of myths: a dragon, a fight in heaven between angels, a woman with cosmic attributes⁽⁶³⁾. The last part of the story is told in the form of a θηριομαχία: the animal fighting with the human being, the dragon fighting with the woman. What maybe are to be considered most enlightening are those representations which K.M. Coleman so charmingly called 'fatal charades': the executions staged as mythological enactments⁽⁶⁴⁾. That was a special form of amusement. The story of the myths is re-enacted, sometimes until death ensues. That is not the case here. The dragon begins his fight, but the woman gets the two wings of the big eagle with which she can fly. The dragon spits water like a river, but the earth comes to the rescue of the woman and swallows all the water. The fight ends undecided, but the rage of the dragon is not satisfied. He continues the fight: "to make war on the rest of the offspring, on those who keep the commandments of God and bear testimony to Jesus" (12,17). Thus also here, in spite of all

⁽⁶²⁾ This past or present is dependent on whether one places the two witnesses in the past or the future of the narrative.

⁽⁶³⁾ Very many studies have appeared, of course, about this text. For the mythical background see in particular J.W. VAN HENTEN, "Dragon Myth and Imperial Ideology in Revelation 12-13", *Society of Biblical Literature 1994 Seminar Papers* (ed. E.H. LOVERING) (Atlanta, GA 1994) 496-515. In the commentaries one finds a more complete bibliography. The following have appeared recently: H. GIESEN, *Studien zur Johannes-apokalypse* (Stuttgart 2000); Chr. NANZ, "Hinabgeworfen wurde der Ankläger unserer Bruder", *Theologie als Vision. Studien zur Johannes-Offenbarung* (Hrsg. K. BACKHAUS) (Stuttgart 2001); J.U. KALMS, *Der Sturz des Gottesfeindes. Traditionsgeschichtliche Studien zu Apokalypse 12* (Neukirchen 2001).

⁽⁶⁴⁾ K.M. COLEMAN, "Fatal Charades", 44-73.

mythological applications, once again a relationship is made with the horrible reality of the mutilation and death which the author of the book foresees for his readers.

*
* *

“Maturus, Sanctus, Blandina, and Attalus were led into the amphitheatre to be exposed to the beasts and to give a public spectacle of the pagans’ inhumanity, for a day of fighting wild beasts (θηριομαχία) was expressly arranged for our sake” (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. V.1.37 about the martyrs of Lyons). Starting from the very first Christian literature until far into the 3rd century a relationship is made between the persecution of Christians and the *munera*⁽⁶⁵⁾. Clement gives presumably a description of a fatal charade when he writes: “Through jealousy women were persecuted as Danaids and Dircae, suffering terrible and unholy dignities” (1 Clement 6.2)⁽⁶⁶⁾. Ignatius writes in different letters that he is on his way πρὸς θηρία (in the letter to the Trallians 10,1 and the Smyrnaeans 4,2) in the simple terms that he shall go to fight with the wild beasts; in the letter to the Romans⁽⁶⁷⁾ 4,1.2; 5,1.2.3 in the more strange formulations that he hopes to be eaten by the wild animals; that the wild animals may become his grave). According to the martyrdom of Carpus, Papyrus of Thyatira and Agathonice of Pergamum the martyrs, after having first been tortured (23.24), are finally brought to death in the amphitheater (37.40.44). In the martyrdom of Polycarp something similar happens. In the beginning of the text the story is about anonymous martyrs who after having been tortured are led (2,4) to the wild beasts (εἰς τὰ θηρία),

⁽⁶⁵⁾ See KYLE, *Spectacles of Death*, 155-182; D. POTTER, “Martyrdom as Spectacle”, *Theater and Society in the Classical World* (ed. R. SCODEL) (Ann Arbor 1993) 53-88 and G.W. BOWERSOCK, *Martyrdom and Rome* (Cambridge 1995).

⁽⁶⁶⁾ COLEMAN, “Fatal Charades”, 66 writes about this text: “Since the mythological Dirce was bound to the horns of a bull..., it is easy to imagine how realistically her fate could be re-enacted in the arena...And, a group of female prisoners furnished with jugs would immediately remind the audience of the Danaids, and they might then be executed in a manner not necessarily corresponding to any known variant of the story”.

⁽⁶⁷⁾ The Letter to the Romans occupies also a special position in a number of other themata. For an introduction and the bibliography about Ignatius, see Ch. MUNIER, “Où en est la question d’ Ignace d’ Antioche? Bilan d’ un siècle de recherches 1870-1988”, *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (Berlin – New York 1993) II. 27.1, 359-484.

about the courage of Germanicus in his fight with the wild animals (θηριομαχία 3,1) and the cowardice of Quintus who indeed recoils (4,1); and then in the second part of the text about Polycarp himself: his predictions that he shall be killed by fire (5,2); his discussion with the proconsul in the arena (6,2; 9,2); the reaction of the people who demands from the asiarch Philip that he unleash a lion on Polycarp and his answer that the time of the κυνηγεσία was finished (12,2); the death of Polycarp in the fire and with the dagger (13,1-15,2) and, finally, the refusal to hand over the body and the public burning (17,1-18,3).

Still more other texts could have been mentioned. The point is clear. The author of the Apocalypse, presumably indeed on the basis of what he has experienced, with his prophecies about the death of the witnesses of Jesus by the dragon and the beast out of the sea, has in any case foreseen rather precisely what would happen in the future.

Theologische Faculteit,
Universiteit Nijmegen
Postbus 9103,
6500HD Nijmegen, Netherlands

† Sjef van TILBORG

SUMMARY

This paper proposes a new suggestion in the discussion regarding possible death threats in the Apocalypse. It makes a comparison between relevant texts from the Apocalypse and what happens during festival days when rich civilians entertain their co-citizens with (gladiatorial) games. At the end of the morning and during the break special fights are organized. Condemned persons are forced to fight against wild animals or against each other to be killed by the animals or by fire. The paper shows that a number of texts from the Apocalypse are better understood, when they are read against this background.

How to Read the First Epistle of John Non-Polemically

While the title may sound strange, most exegetes would agree that the First Epistle of John is a polemical text. Yet, can a polemical text be read non-polemically? As we shall see, many exegetical difficulties are linked with a polemical determination of 1 John. I would go so far as to say that since the polemical character of 1 John has been seen as the key to many exegetical issues of 1 John, the non-polemical approach can provide new solutions to most of them. Further, I argue that, in the case of 1 John, polemics or non-polemics is not a question of one's desire for peace, but a question of the text. In many points the non-polemical approach is much closer to the text than a polemical reading. In the context of the dominance of polemical readings "How to Read 1 John Non-Polemically" is a real question. What follows is not a recipe for the most adequate approach to 1 John, albeit an approach to the text that will challenge some agreements of Johannine scholarship.

I. Polemical and Non-Polemical Readings of 1 John

1. *The Traditional Polemical Paradigm*

The exegesis of 1 John is, in most cases, dominated by the question of the opponents. There is, however, a lot of dissent in the ongoing historical debate about the opponents. But looking at the hermeneutical basis of the current approaches, one can claim that, despite all their discord, the majority of readings and commentaries of 1 John agree on four points:

(1) A basic assumption for them is that in a more or less mirror-like reading, it is possible to reconstruct who the opponents were and what actually happened in the Johannine community⁽¹⁾. Therefore, the text

(¹) A typical representative for this is R.E. Brown, who reads 1 John as "the record of a theological life-and-death struggle within a community at the end of the first century" (R.E. BROWN, *The Epistles of John* [AncB 30; Garden City, NY 1982] x). The question about the identity of the opponents is asked by BROWN, *Epistles*, 55 and by J. BEUTLER, *Die Johannesbriefe* (RNT; Regensburg 2000) 22; H.-J. KLAUCK, *Der erste Johannesbrief* (EKKNT 23/1; Zürich 1991) 35; C.G. KRUSE, *The Letters of John* (The Pillar New Testament Commentary; Grand

of 1 John serves as a window for the world behind, representing one stage of the history of the Johannine community.

(2) On the other hand, the opponents and the conflict between them and the orthodox Johannine community serve as a hermeneutical key to the text, which is nearly always interpreted in the light of the opponents⁽²⁾.

(3) Therefore, not only are 2,18-27; 4,1-6 defined as opponent texts, but also many other slogans and verses are viewed in relation to the opponents. Among these verses are 1,6.8.10; 2,4.6.9; 4,20; 5,6-8⁽³⁾, where contradictory statements as to sin (1,8 versus 3,6.9; 5,18) are seen as a reflection of the opponents' position⁽⁴⁾, the sin unto death (5,16.17) is viewed as referring to the opponents⁽⁵⁾ and the whole ethical parenesis is understood as a response to them guaranteeing the community's cohesion⁽⁶⁾.

(4) Altogether, the polemical function of 1 John is stressed, which is considered as a text greatly determined by its original situation, even by authors who view the Gospel of John more generally⁽⁷⁾. Though being addressed to the Johannine community, 1 John is seen as a part of the struggle against the hostile influence of the opponents.

Rapids 2000) 15-28; D. RENSBERGER, *1 John, 2 John, 3 John* (Abingdon New Testament Commentaries; Nashville 1997) 21-25; G. STRECKER, *Die Johannesbriefe* (KEK 14; Göttingen 1989) 132.

(2) This is evident not only in R.E. Brown's writings, but in most commentaries on 1 John.

(3) E.g. BROWN, *Epistles*, 47-49 passim; KRUSE, *Letters*, 16-17; J. PAINTER, "The 'Opponents' in 1 John", *NTS* 32 (1986) 48-71 (54-64).

(4) KLAUCK, *1. Johannesbrief*, 197-198.

(5) E.g. BROWN, *Epistles*, 617-618; K. GRAYSTON, *The Johannine Epistles* (NCBC; Grand Rapids 1984) 144; RENSBERGER, *1-3 John*, 140.

(6) U.C. VAN WAHLDE, *The Johannine Commandments*. 1 John and the Struggle for the Johannine Tradition (Theological Inquiries; New York 1990) especially 105-137; R.A. WHITACRE, *Johannine Polemic*. The Role of Tradition and Theology (SBLDS 67; Chico, CA 1982) 133-140.

(7) The traditional diachronic readings of John read it also polemically and as a record of the conflicts the community was confronted with. This polemical reading of John is still widespread in R.E. Brown's exegesis (BROWN, *Epistles*, 92 passim; ID., *The Gospel according to John* [AncB 29; New York 1966] I, XXXIV-XXXIX). Elsewhere, there is a tendency to read John more generally, but not 1 John. This is the case in K. SCHOLTISSEK, *In ihm sein und bleiben*. Die Sprache der Immanenz in den johanneischen Schriften (Herders Biblische Studien 21; Freiburg 2000) 364 (John) respectively 340-343 (1 John); O. SCHWANKL, *Licht und Finsternis. Ein metaphorisches Paradigma in den johanneischen Schriften* (Herders Biblische Studien 5; Freiburg 1995) 281-287.

The readings based on these four suppositions can be called polemical. For polemical readings it is characteristic that they consider 1 John as rooted in a polemical dispute. Consequently, the text of 1 John, which is read in a polemical context, is understood as a response or (counter-)attack to someone *vis-à-vis*. Thus, the text model is that of a circle leading from the text to the history of the Johannine community and back to the text.

Beyond these four points of assent there is a lot of disagreement among various polemical readings as to what exactly happened in the Johannine community and what exactly the semantic position of the opponents was⁽⁸⁾. I could add another reconstruction to this wide panorama of already existing research. But the far-reaching disagreement can also make one sceptical and lead one to ask if the hermeneutical presuppositions of such a procedure contribute to progress.

2. *Non-Polemical Approaches and Their Deficiencies*

The starting point for non-polemical readings is the question whether or not the opponents have been overemphasized by many authors and what their status in 1 John actually is. From these critical questions methodological alternatives arise that emphasize the literary character of 1 John and thus see the opponents in a different light. Hence, we can define a reading that does not read 1 John as a polemical text, but as an entity in itself, as non-polemical. In such a reading, even if polemical elements occur, their function is seen as internal.

Non-polemical readings of 1 John are not popular at all. Many authors who do not adhere to them do not even mention them⁽⁹⁾. But, to take the discussion seriously, this silence can no longer be maintained. Therefore, I now want to present briefly the three existing approaches and ask, if they are able to cope with the difficulties underlying the polemical approaches:

The first author to take steps in this direction was J.M. Lieu⁽¹⁰⁾.

⁽⁸⁾ KLAUCK, *1. Johannesbrief*, 34-43.

⁽⁹⁾ A positive exception is R.B. EDWARDS, *The Johannine Epistles* (New Testament Guides; Sheffield 1996) 64-67 who admits: "the polemical character of 1 John has been exaggerated" (64). KRUSE, *Letters*, 16, n. 23, mentions the approach, but does not consider its content at all.

⁽¹⁰⁾ J.M. LIEU, "'Authority to Become Children of God'. A Study of 1 John", *NovT* 23 (1981) 210-228; ID., *The Theology of the Johannine Epistles* (New Testament Theology; Cambridge 1991).

She challenges the approach that takes for self-evident 1 John's character as "a fundamentally polemical writing"⁽¹¹⁾, which, according to Lieu, is an attribution of modern scholars and not of the text itself⁽¹²⁾. She proposes a reading "without immediate and prior reference to the views of its opponents"⁽¹³⁾. Her approach is not general, but sets a different emphasis: "its [1 John's] purpose is not first of all to engage in polemic with outsiders"⁽¹⁴⁾. For Lieu the ethical debate of 1 John is not primarily directed against opponents. Thus, the chief method of Lieu's reading is to separate clearly the ethical debate from the christological debate linked with the opponents. What remains unclear, however, is the exact link between the two debates, as the suspicion arises that Lieu does not follow her strategy of separation consistently⁽¹⁵⁾. Moreover, Lieu challenges the polemical reading from the text of 1 John itself, not from a hermeneutical and an epistemological reflection. So the questions of if and what reconstructions are possible and what role they should play when interpreting 1 John are not fully answered.

T. Griffith was the first scholar to use the term "non-polemical" by proposing "a pastoral rather than a polemical outlook"⁽¹⁶⁾ on 1 John. He continues developing Lieu's thesis about the limited range of opponent texts in 1 John and proves the non-polemical character of the slogans in 1,6.8.10; 2,4.6.9; 4,20 with the help of analogies from secular Greek literature and philosophical debates. He aspires to demonstrate that both the ethical and the christological debate "can be explained without reference to what the group that has left the Johannine community (2,19) positively believes"⁽¹⁷⁾. Nevertheless, he

⁽¹¹⁾ LIEU, "Authority", 212. Hence she claims, "polemics are subordinate to the author's main interest in his readers and the assurance they have" (214-215).

⁽¹²⁾ LIEU, "Authority", 216.

⁽¹³⁾ LIEU, *Theology*, 16.

⁽¹⁴⁾ LIEU, *Theology*, 22.

⁽¹⁵⁾ LIEU, "Authority", 224, where she states with regard to the opponents: "their departure may well have been related to these moral issues". See also LIEU, *Theology*, 106, where she describes love and faith as "inseparable", but does not deepen this thesis. Thereby she underestimates the thematic hierarchy in 1 John and the distribution of the two thematical accents on John and 1 John (see my solution below in III.2 and III.3).

⁽¹⁶⁾ T. GRIFFITH, "A Non-Polemical Reading of 1 John", *TynB* 49 (1998) 253-276 (255, also 275). Cf. also ID., *Keep yourselves from idols. A new look at 1 John* (JSNTSS 233; Sheffield 2002) 108 and 119.

⁽¹⁷⁾ GRIFFITH, "Reading", 253. Cf. also ID., *Keep yourselves from idols*, 118-124.

clearly speaks of a “background”⁽¹⁸⁾ and the tendency of “a group of Johannine Christians to revert to Judaism”⁽¹⁹⁾, thereby locating the schism in the process of the parting of the ways between Christianity and Judaism. To be sure, he plays down the polemical character, but judged critically, his proposal is not as new as one might expect from the title of his paper. While most polemical readings view the text as an internal reassurance of the community facing a certain conflict, Griffith just chooses one of these conflicts — thereby adopting a position shared by many authors before him⁽²⁰⁾ — and so partly falls back into polemical dimensions⁽²¹⁾. Therefore, how does the background help if it cannot be reconstructed and functions merely as a dark cipher?

Let us proceed, then, to the author who is more radical in this respect: D. Neufeld⁽²²⁾. He strongly criticizes the vague and contradictory reconstructions of many authors and comes to the conclusion that “to establish the meaning and significance of the texts on these tentative proposals should not be our starting point”. By contrast, his thesis is “that the author in an imaginative and creative outburst created a linguistic context of an apocalyptic type in which the boasts, confessions, and denials make sense”⁽²³⁾. Thus, Neufeld is the first who leaves speculations about the history of the Johannine

⁽¹⁸⁾ GRIFFITH, “Reading”, 275.

⁽¹⁹⁾ GRIFFITH, “Reading”, 269. Similarly ID., *Keep yourselves from idols*, 174-179.

⁽²⁰⁾ A pioneer in this was A. WURM, *Die Irrlehrer im ersten Johannesbrief* (BibS[F] 8,1; Freiburg 1903). Others who picked up this idea were L. SCHENKE, “The Johannine Schism and the Twelve”, *Critical Readings of John 6* (ed. R.A. CULPEPPER) (Biblical Interpretation Series 22; Leiden 1997) 205-219 (206-207); H. THYEN, “Johannesbriefe”, *TRE* 17 (1988) 186-200 (193-194). This thesis is again countered by W. UEBELE, “*Viele Verführer sind in die Welt ausgegangen*”. Die Gegner in den Briefen des Ignatius von Antiochien und in den Johannesbriefen (BWANT 151; Stuttgart 2001) 134.

⁽²¹⁾ Similar to Griffith’s approach is that of J.V. HILLS, “Sin Is Lawlessness (1 John 3:4)”, *Common Life in the Early Church. Essays Honoring Graydon F. Snyder* (eds. J.V. HILLS – R.B. GARDNER) (Harrisburg, PA 1998) 286-299, who stresses the perspective of 1 John 3 as “communal self-definition”, but does not extend this thesis to 1 John 2. Consequently he describes the genre of 1 John as community order (J.V. HILLS, “A Genre for 1 John”, *The Future of Early Christianity. Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester* [eds. B.A. PEARSON – A.T. KRAABEL] [Minneapolis 1991] 367-377).

⁽²²⁾ D. NEUFELD, *Reconceiving Texts as Speech Acts. An Analysis of 1 John* (Biblical Interpretation Series 7; Leiden 1994).

⁽²³⁾ NEUFELD, *Speech Acts*, 133.

community behind and restricts himself to a purely literary level. His theoretical presumptions (mainly speech act theory) cannot be discussed here⁽²⁴⁾. From a non-polemical view his explanation of the antithetical statements and the depicted schism as warnings to the reader is convincing⁽²⁵⁾. But it is interesting to see, that contrary to Lieu and Griffith, Neufeld still adheres to the traditional range of verses seen as reflections of the opponents, thus considering 1,6.8.10; 2,4.6.9; 4,20 as slogans of hypothetical opponents. The traditional link of christological and ethical deficiency on the opponent's side remains, so that the polemical character and the over-emphasis on the opponents is shifted from a historical level to a hypothetical level. The relationship of faith and love, of self-definition and foe-devaluation can therefore not be described sufficiently in Neufeld's reading. What makes these deficiencies still more evident, is that Neufeld does not take into account the intertextual links with the Gospel of John, which also need a non-polemical explanation.

Looking back, how far are these authors able to solve the problems concomitant with the polemical readings? In what respect do the problems remain unsolved? To sum up, either (in Neufeld's case) the question of the range of opponent texts is not satisfyingly solved, or (in Lieu's and Griffith's case) the hermeneutical and epistemological reflection is missing or only weakly developed. The approaches are sometimes too vague and inconsistent, sometimes (like Neufeld) radical, yet, at the same time, he still transports presumptions of the polemical approach.

Therefore, I would like to propose a non-polemical reading that is more consistent⁽²⁶⁾. Some of the mentioned inconsistencies can be overcome with a text model based on Niklas Luhmann's systems theory and intertextuality, which are the two pillars of my reading. I shall proceed in two steps: first, I will explain the hermeneutical and theoretical implications of the reading. Then, I will outline my reading of 1 John.

⁽²⁴⁾ My main point of criticism is that Neufeld bases his analysis merely on speech act theory and thus on the author and not on the reader. Consequently, he puts too little emphasis on the openness of 1 John and always mentions its compelling character. The only permissible reader's reaction is "acceptance" (NEUFELD, *Speech Acts*, 80). A reader response analysis can amend Neufeld's unilateral approach.

⁽²⁵⁾ NEUFELD, *Speech Acts*, 95, 134 passim.

⁽²⁶⁾ H. SCHMID, *Gegner im 1. Johannesbrief? Zu Konstruktion und Selbstreferenz im johanneischen Sinnsystem* (BWANT 159; Stuttgart 2002).

II. The 'Johannine System' as a Hermeneutical Basis

1. *Intertextuality and the Relationship of the Johannine Writings*

For most readings of 1 John the relationship with the Gospel of John (John) is central. This is no wonder, as the two texts are very closely related with respect to content, vocabulary, and style. Their relationship is determined polemically by most authors considering 1 John as a counterattack against an unorthodox interpretation of John⁽²⁷⁾. The alternative (and less popular) position claims that 1 John is the older document and John constitutes an elaboration of the epistle's kerygma⁽²⁸⁾. Both positions have convincing arguments to support them. What they have in common is that they are based on a particular thesis about the order of the composition of John and 1 John and that each of the two texts is linked with events in the history of the Johannine community so that this history forms the bond between the two texts. When I propose an intertextual model at this point, it is not one of universal intertextuality⁽²⁹⁾, but one restricted to the Johannine writings as a privileged space for intertextual relations. Hence, intertextuality functions as a means to describe the relationship of John and 1 John.

My thesis is that it is not only virtually impossible to trace the bridges between text and history (as will be argued in 2.2.), but also impossible to prove which of the two texts was written before the other. As an example, we may consider John 6,60-71 and 1 John 2,18-27. The close relationship between these two texts has been seen by several authors⁽³⁰⁾. Whereas in John the departure of some of the disciples and Peter's confession is narrated step by step, in 1 John the narrative elements are reduced to a minimum. 1 John uses the narrative flashback on the schism (2,19) as a peg for reflections on the importance of the christological confession and remaining with the community (2,20-27). Both texts have their specific accents; for example, John 6,60-71, in giving the reader the choice to remain (like

⁽²⁷⁾ BROWN, *Epistles*, 91 passim; KLAUCK, *I. Johannesbrief*, 33; UEBELE, *Verführer*, 118.

⁽²⁸⁾ GRAYSTON, *Epistles*, 12-14.

⁽²⁹⁾ Like J. KRISTEVA, *Semeiotike. Recherches pour une sémanalyse* (Paris 1969).

⁽³⁰⁾ SCHENKE, "Schism". For a continuation of Schenke's approach see SCHMID, *Gegner*, 114-125.

Peter and the twelve) or to leave (like many of Jesus' disciples), is pragmatically more open than 1 John 2,18-27, where this choice no longer exists and it is clear on which side the reader stands (e.g. 2,20.24.27). The climax of John 6,60-71 is Peter's exemplary confession (6,68.69) and thus an individual model, whereas in 1 John the adequate christological confession is a general *conditio sine qua non*. The two texts constitute a narrative of and a reflection on the christological border-crossing. Not remaining within the community (1 John) corresponds to no longer walking with Jesus (John). The reader of John following Jesus finds support in the clear encouragement in 1 John 2,18-27, whereas the reader of 1 John will find a pragmatic key in Peter's question in John 6,69 and in his positive example. Therefore, the intertextual relationship of the two texts is not necessarily a temporal one: one might begin telling the story and then add reflections, but one might also extend the reflection into a story which is located within Jesus' journey with his disciples. The differences in the two texts are not due to the date of composition of the text but due to perspective and genre, and both reading-directions are possible.

Thus, I propose an intertextual model constructed from the implicit reader's perspective which combines elements of intertextuality with reader response criticism⁽³¹⁾. Intertextuality is often seen from the author's perspective. But the less declared the intertextual relations are, the more they are the reader's affair⁽³²⁾. This is the case with the Johannine writings, as there is no quotation of John in 1 John or vice versa and no explicit intertextual marker in John or 1 John. The intertextual reader can thus start reading John and proceed to 1 John, or he or she can start reading 1 John and proceed to John. Either text receives an amplified meaning when it is read in the light of the other. Therefore, their relationship can be described as complementary, and the link between them is seen in the reading-process.

Essential for the special intertextual relationship of 1 John and John is the fact that the function of the two texts is different in each case: Whereas John introduces the reader to encountering stories about

⁽³¹⁾ S. HOLTHUIS, *Intertextualität*. Aspekte einer rezeptionsorientierten Konzeption (Tübingen 1993) 225.

⁽³²⁾ G. GENETTE, *Palimpsestes*. La littérature au second degré (Paris 1982) 16. As Genette's concept deals only with massively declared intertextuality and with texts in a clearly temporal relationship (14, 433-434), it is not very helpful for the relationship of John and 1 John.

Jesus and can function as a missionary tract⁽³³⁾, 1 John requires the reader's knowledge about the christological kerygma and develops ethical instruction on this basis (this thesis is further elaborated in III.2.). Constituting one of the two basic texts of this system, 1 John is of equal value and complementary to the Gospel of John and not just a 'situative' intervention into a conflict of the Johannine community. Many of the differences between the two texts can be explained by their *Textsortendifferenz*⁽³⁴⁾ and there is no need to quote two different situations underlying them. Whether the Gospel or 1 John was written first is not relevant from the implicit reader's perspective as both reading directions are fruitful.

The intertextual readings of the two texts lead to what I call the "Johannine system"⁽³⁵⁾. It is not the sum of the two texts but the result of a permanent intertextual reading-circle. As the reader's intertextual construction, it can be described with the help of systems theory.

2. Systems Theory, Delimitation and Self-Construction

According to Niklas Luhmann, a system is an ordered relation of elements. This notion originally developed for social systems has been transferred to texts in literary theory and provides a good basis for a non-polemical reading of 1 John⁽³⁶⁾. A system is principally an entity in itself, the perception of which cannot be based on realism, but on constructivism⁽³⁷⁾. A system produces reality so that the pragmatic

⁽³³⁾ This position, once described as "universally rejected" (T. OKURE, *The Johannine Approach to Mission* [WUNT 31; Tübingen 1988] 10), has become more popular recently: S. MOTYER, *Your Father the Devil? A New Approach to John and "the Jews"* (Carlisle 1997) 6, 57-73, 215-216; D.A. CARSON, *The Gospel according to John* (Leicester 1991) 89-92. An allusion to the missionary character of the community can be seen in the motif of "hearing us" in 1 John 4,6.

⁽³⁴⁾ THYEN, "Johannesbriefe", 191.

⁽³⁵⁾ 2 John and 3 John also belong to the Johannine system. Nevertheless, as real letters (limited addressees in 2 John 1; 3 John 1; greetings in 2 John 13; 3 John 15) and short texts they are not its basic texts. Considering the Johannine writings as a whole, one can therefore speak of a triple *Textsortendifferenz*.

⁽³⁶⁾ H. DE BERG, "Kunst kommt von Kunst. Die Luhmann-Rezeption in der Literatur- und Kunstwissenschaft", *Rezeption und Reflexion. Zur Resonanz der Systemtheorie Niklas Luhmanns außerhalb der Soziologie* (eds. H. DE BERG – S.J. SCHMIDT) (Frankfurt 2000) 175-221; J. FOHRMANN – H. MÜLLER (eds.), *Systemtheorie der Literatur* (München 1996).

⁽³⁷⁾ E. VON GLASERSFELD, "Knowing without Metaphysics: Aspects of the Radical Constructivist Position", *Research and Reflexivity* (ed. F. STEIER) (Inquiries in Social Construction; London 1991) 12-29.

aspect is central. Different topics of 1 John can therefore be seen not as related to external events, but primarily in relation to each other⁽³⁸⁾. On this basis I shall later examine the relationship of love and faith (III.2.).

Systems theory also helps to understand the phenomenon of the opponents since the core of Luhmann's systems theory is the difference between system and environment based on delimitation⁽³⁹⁾. A system comes into being by being separated from its environment and creating a difference from it:

They [systems] constitute and maintain themselves by creating and maintaining a difference from their environment, and they use their boundaries to regulate this difference. [...] In this sense boundary maintenance is system maintenance⁽⁴⁰⁾.

By boundary maintenance the system forms and maintains itself. The central question is, therefore, not how the system interacts with its environment, but how the difference is created by and treated within the system. Luhmann frequently uses the term self-reference, which can be found in all acts of the system⁽⁴¹⁾. The system speaks of its environment in its own language from which it is impossible to reconstruct the environment. Self-contact is the only form of environmental contact⁽⁴²⁾ so that the environment constitutes the system's own product: "Thus the complexity of the world neither repeats itself nor is reflected within systems. There is no depiction of the 'environment' within them"⁽⁴³⁾.

What does this mean for the opponents? They are a way for the system to speak about itself by means of a personalized delimitation. Even when 1 John speaks about opponents in the third person, this refers to the system itself. This does not mean automatically that the opponents are banned to the realm of hypothesis. There may have been opponents, but 1 John read self-referentially is not an adequate source to get to know something about them. The question is, therefore, not who the opponents were but with which purpose 1 John creates them.

⁽³⁸⁾ N. LUHMANN, *Social Systems* (trans. J. Bednarz, Jr. with D. Baecker; Stanford, CA 1995) (first German edition 1984).

⁽³⁹⁾ T. Griffith also emphasizes "the need to reinforce the limits of the Johannine community" (GRIFFITH, "Reading", 253). Luhmann's theory can provide a theoretical foundation for this accent.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ LUHMANN, *Social Systems*, 17.

⁽⁴¹⁾ LUHMANN, *Social Systems*, 33 defines self-reference as "the unity that [...] a system [...] is for itself".

⁽⁴²⁾ LUHMANN, *Social Systems*, 33.

⁽⁴³⁾ LUHMANN, *Social Systems*, 444.

The focus is thus shifted from the reconstruction of the opponents to the literary strategies of the text in its identity-making.

Delimitation is central, but considered in a different perspective than it is traditionally. In the context of the broader strategy of delimitation the function of the opponents has to be discussed in a wider perspective. The complexity of the policy of delimitation in the Johannine system becomes apparent when we consider more such personalized delimitations: the cosmos, “the Jews” and the opponents, each of which has its particular function⁽⁴⁴⁾. Thus, the opponents as a minor theme of 1 John represent one of several strategies of self-definition and delimitation within the “Johannine system”⁽⁴⁵⁾.

III. The Function of the Opponent Texts in 1 John

1. *The Opponents’ Motif and Eschatology*

Self-reference means, first of all, that everything is formulated in the system’s language or worldview. The worldview of 1 John is apocalyptic, and the fact that 1 John calls the opponents antichrists (2,18; 4,3), false prophets (4,1) and seducers (2,27) proves that their apocalyptic contextualization is central. The opponents do not stand alone, but they are one apocalyptic motif among others, representing one element of a broader eschatological scenario. Since I view them as an element within a larger inventory, not the opponents, the apocalyptic worldview is at the centre of the Johannine system. It is a worldview in which distress and salvation are close to each other⁽⁴⁶⁾.

The motif of the opponents is linked with the following apocalyptic motifs illustrating the eschatological scenario:

(1) The motif of the last hour: in 1 John this last hour is not characterized by an eschatological catastrophe, but by a christological opposition of confession and denial, of Christ and Antichrist, of truth and lie. Whereas in John the hour is a central christological concept,

⁽⁴⁴⁾ SCHMID, *Gegner*, 267-271.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ These reflections on the basis of systems theory are congruous with the rhetorical device of σύγκρισις using contrasting figures and “the foil of another life to sharpen the features of the honoree”. Generally it can be stated “that antithesis and personal opposition were integral parts of virtually all attempts of persuasion” (S. MASON [ed.], *Life of Josephus. Translation and Commentary* [Leiden 2001] xxxiv). In 1 John, the opponents are drawn as figures in contrast to the believing community.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ J.J. COLLINS, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London 1997) 57.

the last hour as a consolidation of the widespread notion of the last day(s) (Isa 2,2; Ezek 38,1; Mic 4,1; John 6,39.40.54; 11,24; 12,48) is linked with the opposite forces. The upcoming antichrists are the sign that enables the reader to recognize the last hour (1 John 2,18). In this last hour, in spite of being endangered by the opponent's false statements (2,19), the community stands firm, as it knows the truth (2,20.21). At the same time, the last hour gives the following exhortation (2,28.29) the necessary urgency.

(2) The motif of division: the division within the community affecting even inner relations is an eschatological event (cf. 1 Cor 11,18.19). It is a sign of the last hour for which the activity of anti-divine forces is characteristic (Mark 13,5.6.22; Acts 20,9.30; 2 Thess 3,4.9.10; Jude 17.18; 2 Pet 2,1-3). By this division, which is set in the core of the community, one gains clarity about the nature of each human being⁽⁴⁷⁾ — nothing can be concealed any more (1 John 2,19).

(3) The motif of victory: the aim of the presentation of the eschatological scenario in 1 John is to strengthen the community, for the result of the eschatological fight is not open, but it is the community and the one who adheres to God who has won. The victory is not only promised, it is also proclaimed. It is the victory over the opponents (4,4) and, finally, over the whole cosmos (5,4.5), reflecting the universality of the final struggle. Due to the focus on christology in the Johannine system, it is not the victory of the just⁽⁴⁸⁾, but the victory occurs thanks to the christological confession.

(4) The motif of the two spirits: spirits are a common motif in apocalyptic literature. As in 1 John 4,6, TestXII.Jud 20,1-5 mentions δύο πνεύματα: τὸ τῆς ἀλήθειας καὶ τὸ τῆς πλάνης. The central idea in 1 John is that spirits operate within the human and can be upholders of christological confession or of christological denial. Consequently, it may happen that the evil spirit gains too much room, which constitutes one of the principal dangers for the believer. But, here again, the believer's position is clear. On the one hand, the motif of the spirits strengthens the community because it is convinced that it has received the spirit promised by Jesus (cf. 3,24; 4,13 and the promises in John 14,16.17; 14,25.26; 15,26.27; 16,7-15). On the other hand, it is an incentive to be watchful, for the reader is exhorted to discern the spirits (1 John 4,1).

⁽⁴⁷⁾ The verb φανερώω which occurs here is typically used in an eschatological context (1 John 3,2; Col 3,4; 1 Pet 5,4).

⁽⁴⁸⁾ This is the case in many early Jewish texts like 1 En 9,12; 93,3.7; 98,12; Jub 23,30; 24,29.

The apocalyptic scenario has been described as typical for the opponent texts in 1 John, where it is made concrete by an opposition of confession and denial. Now the question arises which role this scenario plays in the macro-context of 1 John. Although its function is complex, the principal function is related to the main theme of 1 John which will now be considered.

2. Faith as a Basis for Love

The relationship of love and faith is a central question of the Johannine system. It can be answered by both looking at the position of the opponent texts in 1 John and taking into account the intertextual dimension which results together with John. Faith and the christological issues depicted in 2,18-27; 4,1-6 are not the main topic of 1 John, but the two texts are integrated within a chain of argumentation about ethics and sin.

First, the two opponent texts function as excursuses depicting an apocalyptic scenario that urges the reader to walk in the right way with his or her deeds. The fact that it is the last hour makes the ethical exhortation more urgent and forceful. The one who does God's will remains in eternity (2,17) and therefore needs not fear the last hour. The verses 2,28.29 move again to the ethical issue, which thus frames the christological excursus in 2,18-27. This is made evident by the recurring phrase ὁ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ in 2,17 and 2,28. Likewise, verse 4,7 (following the two-spirits-scenario with christological phrases in 4,1-6) is an exhortation in the first person to love one another continuing the theme of 3,11-24.

Second, the two opponent texts operate as a basis for the ethical parenesis⁽⁴⁹⁾: having surpassed the scenario of danger, the reader returns strengthened to the ethical issues. Moreover, the main function of the two texts is not to deal with the opponents and their position, but to articulate words of encouragement to the reader so that the opponents are rather an instrument of self-assurance. This is evident again in both opponent texts: 2,20.27 stress that the reader has the "chrisma", which finally makes him or her immune to the dangers of the antichrists, and 4,4.6 emphasize that the reader is "from God", so that it is absolutely clear on which side he or she stands. He or she has received God's gifts and is able on this basis to act correspondingly.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ A.E. BROOKE, *The Johannine Epistles* (ICC; Edinburgh 1912) 117 speaks of "love based on faith".

A key verse for the relationship of love and faith is 1 John 3,23, which links love and faith within a double commandment. The following structure of 1 John outlines this commandment: beginning with a relatively short passage about faith (4,1-6), longer passages about love follow (starting with 4,7 and again 4,11)⁽⁵⁰⁾. Whereas the reader's position on faith is clear and he or she is charged to discern and judge others (4,1), in the ethical field he or she now has to become active. It is thus God's commandment not only to believe, but also to love in order to demonstrate that one is really ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ (4,2.4.6.7)⁽⁵¹⁾. Thus 3,23 both structures the following sections of 1 John and sums up the relationship of love and faith.

This thesis about the relationship of love and faith is reinforced by an intertextual reading. In general, the themes of love and faith are distinctly handled by the two basic texts of the Johannine system: whereas John makes the reader encounter Jesus and introduces him or her to christological issues, 1 John consists mainly of ethical parenesis. Thus, the two texts and the two themes with them form the two poles of the intertextual reading circle already mentioned. The key verse for this relationship is John 13,35 — which is not developed further in John (though the reader finds some basic ideas in John 15 about Christ's exemplary love and the *imitatio Christi* is recommended in 15,10.12). In the narration, it is located at a point where Jesus is in community with his disciples and it is clear that the reader will remain (long after the schism of 6,60-71). It constitutes an external prolepsis⁽⁵²⁾. To fulfil the distinctive marks of a follower of

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Especially 1 John 4,15; 5,1.5.20 return to the christological issue, but this is seen as a new recurrence of the basis at a moment of eschatological distress. The other christological (or more precisely soteriological) confessions concern atonement and sin and thus constitute a part of the ethical parenesis itself (1,7.9; 2,1.2; 3,5.16; 4,9.14). This is also the case for 5,6-8, which stresses Christ's atonement and his ethical exemplariness. For this interpretation of 5,6-8, see SCHMID, *Gegner*, 202-204.

⁽⁵¹⁾ Although it is my intention here to separate the two fields of love and faith, it must be conceded that the two are not only firmly linked, but also mixed in 3,16; 4,11 (Christ/God as ethical models) and 4,16 (belief in love). The new accent of a non-polemical reading is to interpret 1 John as a general ethical exhortation, not as a "situation" ethics of a sect-like community in crisis, in which latter case ethics would be a community-strengthening response to the opponents (see e.g. BROWN, *Epistles*, 92 speaking about "close love within a community over against those outside").

⁽⁵²⁾ R.A. CULPEPPER, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel. A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia 1983) 63 and F.J. MOLONEY, "The Function of John 13-17

Christ, the reader himself or herself has to become active and 1John guides him or her to do so. Thus, the two texts refer to each other: the christological allusions often consisting of short confessional phrases in 1 John (e.g. 2,22.23; 3,23; 4,2.3.15; 5,1.5.20) refer to the comprehensive christological discussions in John (especially in John 1–12), whereas the reflections in 1 John develop the ethical allusions made in the farewell discourse of the Gospel.

The strategy of the ethical exhortation in 1 John is the following: the text of 1 John can be regarded as a linear reading-process with blanks⁽⁵³⁾ leading the reader through the main ethical theme of 1 John. It is dominated by general reflection on ethics, but becomes concrete in 3,17. In the reading-process, the reader proceeds from an introduction of the love commandment (2,3-11) to its christological (3,16) and theological basis (4,11), then through a complex and partly contradictory structure with regard to sin (1,8 compared with 3,6.9; 5,18), which produces a conflict in the reader. The climax is represented by the “sin unto death” (5,16.17), which must not be seen as referring to the opponents but as a blank⁽⁵⁴⁾. It follows the pragmatic strategy of marking a limit of God’s forgiveness, initiating the reader’s critical self-reflection about her or his own standpoint and making the reader ask if he or she might commit or have committed such a sin. The role played by the opponents with regard to this self-reflection has to be examined next. As they are not mentioned in the passages about love and sin, the link cannot be a direct one. But, as we find both types of texts in the same one 1 John, there must be a kind of indirect link to be formed by the reader.

3. *The Opponents as a Counter-Concept*

It may be concluded that the main function of the opponents interacting with the reader is to operate as a counter-concept to the community⁽⁵⁵⁾. The opponents are what the reader should never become,

within the Johannine Narrative”, *What is John?* (ed. F.F. SEGOVIA) (SBL Symposium Series, 7; Atlanta 1998) II, 43-65 (64).

⁽⁵³⁾ W. ISER, *The Act of Reading. A Theory of Aesthetic Response* (London 1978).

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Contrary to BROWN, *Epistles*, 617-618. For it is neither stated in the text who might commit such a sin, nor what action would constitute a “sin unto death”. As the text is not very concrete here, I speak of a blank and describe its pragmatic function.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Here and elsewhere in my concept, community is understood as the community of readers.

but what he or she will become if he or she does not follow the basic commandments and lines of the Johannine system. As a personification of denial and border-crossing they illustrate the way of departure, which is the opposite way to mission and joining the community so that the borders of the Johannine system are neither absolute, yet always endangered.

This function of the opponents is linked with the theme of love and faith in a characteristic manner. Whereas both love and faith are required by the community (3,23), border-crossing is illustrated in 1 John in different ways: in the ethical field, it is the community itself that is blamed⁽⁵⁶⁾, in the christological field, the offence is attributed to external opponents⁽⁵⁷⁾. In christology, the reader has certainty so that the christological confessions can be proclaimed briefly and need not be discussed⁽⁵⁸⁾. In the ethical field he or she has to become active while being constantly endangered. The christological transgression of the opponents is a paradigmatic transgression and a warning to the reader, illustrating at the same time the detrimental consequences of border-crossing. A hint of this is the fact that the vocabulary used in 2,18-27; 4,1-6 can be partly found again in 1,6.8.10: *πλανάω* (1,8 – 2,26), *ψεύδομαι* (1,6 – *ψεύδος* 2,21.27 and *ψευδοπροφήται* in 4,1) and *ψεύστης* (1,10 – 2,22). This makes the ethical border-crossing of the 'we' comparable to the opponent's christological border-crossing. As a result, the reader composes his or her own text by directly confronting the two border-crossings.

On the pragmatic level, the opponents invite the reader to check his or her relationship to the Johannine system. Looking at 2,19, where the opponents are connected as close to the community as possible, makes the reader reflect, if not he himself or she herself might be or become one of the antichrists⁽⁵⁹⁾. The theme of 2,19 is that of belonging or not belonging to the community. In a self-referential perspective, the reader, not the opponents, is at the core of this verse. Knowing about the double commandment of faith and love, the reader's conclusion can

⁽⁵⁶⁾ This is a kind of first-person delimitation (1 John 1,6.8.10). In 2,4.6.9; 4,20 the delimitation is expressed in a neutral third person in the sense of "anybody" and not referring (exclusively) to the opponents.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ Therefore, I only consider 2,18-27; 4,1-6 and nothing more as opponent texts.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ This is evident in 3,23; 4,15; 5,1.5.20, but also in the passages 2,18-27; 4,1-6, which contain no real discussions about the identity of Christ like John, but merely dialectical phrases. See also n. 51.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ This pragmatic interpretation shows that this verse, usually taken as evidence for a historical event behind the text, can also be read differently.

follow that a transgression in ethics is equivalent to a transgression in christology, which has been illustrated with the help of the opponents. For the reader, the motif of the opponents is thus a “reminder of the perennial possibility of failure”⁽⁶⁰⁾.

*
* *

Is a non-polemical reading of 1 John convincing and what are its implications? The position with regard to the four points mentioned as characteristic for the polemical approach at the beginning is different. 1 John is not a polemical text in its whole, but only in minor parts. A non-polemical reading demonstrates how the opponents’ motif is related to the main ethical theme of 1 John. This motif, which may be understood as polemical in a rhetorical sense, is thereby interpreted non-polemically as a special type of self-description. Furthermore, I see the following advantages of the non-polemical model:

1 John is often regarded as secondary to John. A non-polemical reading is also a kind of rehabilitation of 1 John, which is no longer described as a “situative” intervention into a past conflict, but as a general text of equal weight to John. The intertextual perspective is also a new model for the relationship of John and 1 John, taking into account both their similarities and their different genre. In addition to this, it bursts open the limits of a historicist model (the presuppositions of which have seldom been explained in the exegesis of 1 John). Questions that cannot be answered recede and more emphasis is put on the text itself and a close-reading of it. Hence, contradictions within the text, which were traditionally explained by means of the opponents, can now be described as steps within a complex reading-process. The question of the semantic of the christological confessions remains relevant, but is embedded into a pragmatic perspective on the function of denial and confession and thus is no more the key issue in reading 1 John.

Moreover, a non-polemical reading of 1 John is more open for relevance to the present so that today’s reader can participate in the reading and 1 John is no longer simply a story about a community more than 1900 years ago, but a story about oneself⁽⁶¹⁾. A further gain is that

⁽⁶⁰⁾ F.J. MOLONEY, *Signs and Shadows*. Reading John 5–12 (Minneapolis 1996) 204.

⁽⁶¹⁾ R.A. CULPEPPER, *The Gospel and the Letters of John* (Interpreting Biblical Texts; Nashville 1998) 287 asks: “Can the Gospel of John continue to function for Christians as a document of faith in the increasing pluralism of American

the text model proposed in this article contributes to the exegetical discussion of intertextuality, systems theory and constructivism.

Finally, I want to return to the aspect of polemics as a category, to which the non-polemical reading (as a method) can also make an important contribution. We find polemics in many places, not only in 1 John. In the usual polemical reading the polemic would be emphasized and thereby legitimated as a response of orthodoxy to the heretics. A non-polemical-reading, however, constitutes a self-critical reading of polemics that tries to find the reasons for the polemics in the community itself and thereby helps to overcome polarization⁽⁶²⁾. The question of the adequacy of polemics, however, is another issue⁽⁶³⁾.

Akademie der Diözese Rottenburg-Stuttgart Hansjörg SCHMID
Im Schellenkönig 61
70184 Stuttgart, Germany

SUMMARY

When reading 1 John most contemporary interpreters stress its polemical character and use the opponents as a key for the whole text. In contrast to them, this article proposes a non-polemical reading which treats the opponents only as a minor feature of 1 John and denies the possibility of mirror-reading the epistle. The article shows the merits, but also the inconsistencies of already existing non-polemical readings of 1 John. It describes the relationship between 1 John and John as an intertextual reading-process and views the opponents as literary contrasting figures. They form a part of an apocalyptic scenario and are related to the main ethical theme of 1 John. The pragmatic function of the excursus-like opponent texts (1 John 2,18-27; 4,1-6) is to strengthen and reassure the reader by demonstrating that he or she is immune to the opponent's denial of the christological confession. On this basis, the ethical parenthesis takes place, the urgency of which is stressed by the apocalyptic motifs. As a result, the reader tries to avoid an ethical transgression by which he or she would become like the christological opponents, who thus function as a counter-concept to the community.

culture?" It is interesting to observe that, though treating all of Johannine literature in his book, he only asks this question for John. This is symptomatic for a merely historic reading of 1 John.

⁽⁶²⁾ Self-reference, therefore, does not mean a steady blame of the subject — there may be adequate reasons for polemics and calling somebody an opponent, but it does indeed involve a change of perspectives.

⁽⁶³⁾ See the author's reflections on this issue: H. SCHMID, "Gegner werden gemacht. Neutestamentliche, religionsgeschichtliche und aktuelle Perspektiven", *ZKT* 124 (2002) 385-396.

Use of the Letter of Jude by the Second Letter of Peter

It seems obvious to all readers that there is some kind of close relationship between Jude and 2 Peter. For good reasons it is now widely accepted that 2 Peter is dependent on Jude⁽¹⁾. This is so much the case that authors at times overstate this dependence, saying that 2 Peter has simply incorporated Jude⁽²⁾. A closer examination shows that the relationship is not this simple. The author of 2 Peter adapted Jude 4-18 in 2 Pet 2,1-3,3. The purpose of this paper is to offer a detailed description and explanation of this adaptation. I will describe at the level of vocabulary and syntax the way 2 Peter has modified Jude and attempt to understand the significance of these modifications.

For the most part 2 Peter has not adapted Jude by quoting it directly. While 2 Peter contains many of the words and some phrases found in Jude, no sentence of Jude is quoted in 2 Peter. However, twice clauses of Jude are used in 2 Peter with little change. These passages are Jude 13b / 2 Pet 2,17b

οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα
τετήρηται

οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους τετήρηται.

and Jude 17-18 / 2 Pet 3,2-3

1,17 ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί, μνησθητε τῶν
ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν
ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ
Χριστοῦ

3,2 μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων
ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν καὶ
τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ
κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος,

(¹) For this view see E.M. SIDEBOTTOM, *James, Jude, and 2 Peter* (NCB; London – Edinburgh 1967) 68-69; J.N.D. KELLY, *The Epistles of Peter and of Jude* (HNTC; New York – Evanston 1969) 226-227; D. SENIOR, *1 and 2 Peter* (NTM 20; Wilmington, DE 1980) 102; R.J. BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter* (WBC 50; Waco, TX 1983) 142-143; J.H. NEYREY, *2 Peter, Jude* (AB 37C; New York 1993) 122; P. PERKINS, *First and Second Peter, James and Jude* (Louisville 1995) 178. D.F. Watson has argued for the priority of Jude on rhetorical grounds (*Invention, Arrangement, and Style: Rhetorical Criticism of Jude and 2 Peter* [SBLDS 104; Atlanta 1988] 160-187).

(²) See for example, W. MARXSEN, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Philadelphia 1968) 241; H. KOESTER, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Philadelphia – New York – Berlin 1982) II, 56; B.D. EHRLMAN, *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings* (New York – Oxford 1997) 394.

1,18 ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν· [ὅτι] ἐπ' ἐσχάτου
[τοῦ] χρόνου ἔσονται ἐμποῦνται κατὰ
τὰς ἐαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι τῶν
ἀσεβειῶν.

3,3 τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες ὅτι
ἐλεύσονται ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν
[ἐν] ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμποῦνται κατὰ τὰς
ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι.

It seems that 2 Peter's use of Jude can best be described as a rather free paraphrase⁽³⁾. Working from the written text of Jude, the author of 2 Peter re-wrote Jude, avoiding direct quotation, but using much of Jude's language. The procedure was similar to that used by the author of a paper like this one who paraphrases the work of others in developing his/her own presentation⁽⁴⁾.

Jude 4–18 consists of 311 words. 2 Pet 2,1–3,3 incorporated 80 of these words directly and substituted synonyms for another 7 of these words. In these ways 2 Pet 2,1–3,3 used 28% of the vocabulary of Jude 4–18. 22 of the 87 words of Jude 4–18 used in 2 Pet 2,1–3,3, or 25% of them, are found in the two clauses that are virtual quotations from Jude, i.e., 2 Pet 2,17b and 3,2–3. Another 23 words (= 26%) are used by 2 Peter in the same syntactical structures as found in Jude: participial phrases (2 Pet 2,1.10), clauses (2 Pet 2,11–12.17), an adjective-noun phrase (2 Pet 2,12), and direct address (2 Pet 3,1). The remaining 42 of the words taken by 2 Pet 2,1–3,3 from Jude 4–18, or 48% of them, are used in syntactical structures different than those found in Jude. All of this clearly indicates the degree to which 2 Peter has reworked Jude.

2 Pet 2,1–3,3 consists of 426 words. The 87 of these words that are taken from Jude 4–18 constitute 20% of the total. This is another indication of how completely 2 Peter has reworked Jude.

The principal purpose of 2 Peter is to argue against those who denied that Jesus would come again⁽⁵⁾. This is most explicit in 3,4–10, but the earlier part of the letter prepares for this explicit argument. As part of that preparation, in 2,1–3,3 the author of 2 Peter criticized false teachers who would arise among its addressees. This section of the

⁽³⁾ Sidebottom, *James*, 95, 112.

⁽⁴⁾ Bauckham says, "This dependence is never slavish. The author takes what he wants from Jude, whether ideas or words, and uses it in a composition that is very much his own" (*Jude, 2 Peter*, 236). "It is characteristic of our author's use of Jude that he gets an idea from Jude and then gives it a fresh twist or development of his own..." (*Jude, 2 Peter*, 260).

⁽⁵⁾ KELLY, *Epistles*, 229; BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 154–157; WATSON, *Invention*, 82. Neyrey describes the purpose of the letter as opposition to those "who rejected traditional theodicy" (*2 Peter, Jude*, 122).

letter criticized both the content of their teaching and the immoral behavior that flowed from it. Jude is mainly a critique of the immoral behavior of its opponents⁽⁶⁾. However, the author of 2 Peter adapted Jude to serve as an argument against both the teaching and the behavior of its opponents. In order to do so, 2 Peter made rather free use of Jude.

In adapting Jude, the author of 2 Peter also changed Jude's critique of a group presently confronting its readers into prediction of a group that will confront the readers of 2 Peter in the future. This may have been required by the fiction that the author is Peter, writing in the past. This was not difficult to do; it was mainly a matter of changing the aorist of Jude 4 into future tense in 2 Pet 2,1-3. Jude 5-7.9 describe historical precedents for the error of Jude's present opponents, and Jude 17-18 contains a prediction of their arrival; both of these served 2 Peter's purpose without alteration of tense. And Jude's description of its opponents in present tense in vv. 8.10-13, and 16 could be used as a description of the future opponents predicted by 2 Peter, taking its meaning in 2 Peter from the tense of 2,1-3. However, the author of 2 Peter made several other changes in the tense of the verbs he took from Jude; these will be noted below.

In what follows I will consider each section of 2 Pet 2,1-3,3 in turn and discuss the way the author has used Jude in that section.

1. Jude 4(-5) / 2 Pet 2,1-3

1,4 παρεισέδυσαν γάρ τινες ἄνθρωποι, οἱ πάσαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα, ἄσεβεις, τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἄρνούμενοι.

2,1 Ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐν τῷ λαῷ ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, οἳ τινες παρεισάξουσιν αἵρέσεις ἀπαλείας

καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἄρνούμενοι. ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς ταχινήν ἀπάλειαν,
2,2 καὶ πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελείαις δι' οὗ ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται,

⁽⁶⁾ For descriptions of the purpose of Jude see BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 11-13; WATSON, *Invention*, 29-30; NEYREY, *2 Peter, Jude*, 31-32; L. THURÉN, "Hey Jude! Asking for the Original Situation and Message of a Catholic Epistle", *NTS* 43 (1997) 451-465.

2,3 καὶ ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ πλαστοῖς λόγοις
 ὑμᾶς ἐμπορεύσονται, οἳ τὸ κρίμα
 ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια
 αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει.

1,5 Ὑπομνήσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι,
 εἰδότες [ὑμᾶς] πάντα ὅτι [ὁ] κύριος ἄπαξ
 λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σῶσας τὸ δεύτερον
 τοὺς μὴ πιστευσάντας ἀπόλεσεν,

In addition to changing its tense, the author of 2 Peter made other changes in Jude 4 (and 5) in adapting it in 2,1-3. The author of 2 Peter began his condemnation of future opponents by saying that false prophets arose among the people, i.e., the people of Israel. Only then did he say that false teachers will likewise appear in the future. The reference to false prophets created a chiastic relationship between 2 Pet 2,1-3 and 1,16-21. The false prophets of 2,1a are a negative counterpart of the true prophets mentioned in 1,19-21; the false teachers of 2,1b-3 are a negative counterpart of the apostolic teachers mentioned in 1,16-18⁽⁷⁾. In this way the author of 2 Peter connected the critique of false teachers in 2,1-3,3 with the earlier part of the letter.

2 Pet 2,1a seems to be an adaptation of Jude 5⁽⁸⁾. For Jude this was the first of a series of historical precedents for condemnation of the author's opponents, namely, the Lord's salvation of the people of Israel from Egypt and later destruction of those who did not believe. 2 Peter did not make use of this as a precedent. However, it may underlie the reference to the false prophets that arose among the people. 2 Peter may have taken the word "people" from Jude 5. And 2 Peter may assume that it was the presence of false prophets in Israel that led some not to believe and to be destroyed.

The remainder of 2 Pet 2,1-3 is more directly related to Jude 4. The latter is a very compact description of those whom Jude criticizes. They are described in a main clause, and further described in three participial phrases and an adjective. 2 Pet 2,1b-3 rearranged and elaborated these elements. The main clause of Jude 4 says, "Certain people have stolen in among you". 2 Pet 2,1b specifies the people as false teachers. The author of 2 Peter replaced "have stolen in among you" with "will be among you". He then added a relative clause

⁽⁷⁾ BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 236; WATSON, *Invention*, 106.

⁽⁸⁾ WATSON, *Invention*, 173-174. Watson attributes to Fornberg the suggestion that adaptation of Jude 5 in 2 Peter 2,1 explains why Jude 5 is not included in the list of examples in 2 Peter 2,4-10a (p. 173).

describing the false teachers as ones “who will secretly bring in destructive opinions”. The verb of this clause has the same prefixes (i.e., *παρεισ*) as the verb in the main clause of Jude 4. Jude criticized the presence of certain people and their way of life; 2 Peter changed this into a critique of those who will be present and teach falsely in the future. This false teaching is denial of the second coming of Christ⁽⁹⁾. 2 Peter says that their opinions are destructive, that they bring destruction on themselves (v. 1), and that their destruction is not asleep (v. 3). This emphasis on destruction may owe something to Jude’s reference to God’s destruction of unbelievers in v. 5. This repetition of the word “destruction” in close proximity in three different cases constitutes a figure of speech called polyptoton.

After adapting the main clause of Jude 4, 2 Peter passed over a participial phrase, an adjective, and another participial phrase, and went directly to the final participial phrase with which Jude described its opponents, i.e., they “deny our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ”. For the author of 2 Peter this is the most important criticism of his opponents. From Jude, 2 Peter took only the words “denying the Master”. But 2 Peter replaced the adjective “only” and the phrase “and our Lord Jesus Christ”, with two participial phrases. The first describes the Master as the one “who bought them”; the second observes that by this denial they bring “swift destruction on themselves”. Describing Jesus as the Master “who bought them” emphasized the heinousness of denying him. 2 Peter’s second elaboration made the consequences of denying the Master explicit.

By moving the phrase “denying the Master” forward, the author of 2 Peter made it a description of the content of the false teaching he opposes. In Jude 4 the phrase probably spells out what Jude sees as the implications of the opponents’ manner of life. For 2 Peter it summarizes the teaching of the opponents, i.e., their denial of the second coming of Jesus, as well as the behavior that follows from this teaching (cf. 2,2)⁽¹⁰⁾. Also in line with 2 Peter’s use of the material of Jude to criticize teachers, 2 Pet 2,2 adds that many will follow them. Watson suggests that this also forms an *inclusio* with the author’s

⁽⁹⁾ T. FORNBERG, *An Early Church in a Pluralistic Society: A Study of 2 Peter* (ConBNT 9; Lund 1977) 36.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Watson (*Invention*, 174) and Neyrey (2 *Peter, Jude*, 188-89) think the opponents deny Jesus by denying his second coming. Bauckham argues that the opponents deny Jesus by teaching and practicing immorality (*Jude, 2 Peter*, 241). Kelly thinks their denial took both forms (*Epistles*, 320).

denial in 1,16 that he and others followed cleverly devised myths⁽¹¹⁾. This is another way the author of 2 Peter connected 2,1–3,3 with the earlier part of the letter.

The second participial phrase of Jude 4 says that its opponents “pervert the grace of our God into licentiousness”. Of this 2 Pet 2,2 used only the word “licentiousness” and made it plural rather than singular. The verse says that many will follow the “licentiousnesses” of the false teachers, and that on account of them the way of truth will be maligned; the latter may be an allusion to Isa 52,5⁽¹²⁾. The reference to the “way of truth” anticipates use of similar language in 2 Pet 2,15 and 21. Fornberg argues that licentiousness here does not have its ordinary meaning of “sexual immorality” but instead refers to the opponents’ doctrinal error⁽¹³⁾. To me it seems more likely that it does have its ordinary meaning and that sexual immorality is seen as a consequence of the opponents’ doctrinal error. The accusation of sexual immorality is repeated in 2,10.13–14.18; and 3,3. 2 Pet 2,3 adds that in their greed the false teachers will make a profit of the readers with false words. The accusation of greed anticipates the similar accusation in 2,14–15⁽¹⁴⁾.

The first participial phrase of Jude 4 says that its opponents “long ago were designated for this condemnation”. Of this, 2 Pet 2,3 used the term “condemnation” and a slightly different form of the adverb “long ago”; here as elsewhere the author of 2 Peter shows a preference for unusual vocabulary. 2 Pet 2,3 made “condemnation” the subject of a new clause and said of the false teachers that their “condemnation, pronounced against them long ago, is not idle, and their destruction is not asleep”. Sometimes use of the present tense in this clause is seen as a failure to sustain the fiction that Peter is the author of the letter. Bauckham sees it as an intentional shift to allow direct argument with the opponents; such a shift is possible because attribution of the letter to Peter is a convention that the readers understand⁽¹⁵⁾. Watson argues

⁽¹¹⁾ WATSON, *Invention*, 106–107.

⁽¹²⁾ BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 242; WATSON, *Invention*, 109.

⁽¹³⁾ FORNBERG, *Early Church*, 37–38.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Accusations of immorality and greed were conventional in contemporary polemic and may not be reliable indications of the actual behavior of those attacked by 2 Peter. On this see L.T. JOHNSON, “The New Testament’s Anti-Jewish Slander and the Conventions of Ancient Polemic”, *JBL* 108 (1989) 419–441, especially p. 432.

⁽¹⁵⁾ BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 245.

that it is a futuristic use of the present tense⁽¹⁶⁾. The author of 2 Peter argues the truth of 2,3 in vv. 4-10a.

Thus 2 Pet 2,1-3 is a thorough revision of Jude 4-5. This revision served to connect the material 2 Peter adapted from Jude with the earlier part of 2 Peter, to predict the coming of false teachers, and to introduce the main things for which they would be criticized in 2 Pet 2,4-3,3. The author of 2 Peter rewrote the main clause and final participial phrase of Jude 4 in 2 Pet 2,1; he rewrote the second participial phrase from Jude 4 in 2 Pet 2,2; and he rewrote the first participial phrase from Jude 4 in 2 Pet 2,3. 2 Peter's reference to the people of Israel in 2,1 and its three references to destruction of the false teachers in 2,1.3 may have been suggested by Jude 5.

2. Jude 5-8a / 2 Pet 2,4-10a

1,5 Ὑπομνήσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι,
εἰδότας [ὑμᾶς] πάντα ὅτι [ὁ] κύριος ἅπαξ
λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σῶσας τὸ δεύτερον
τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν,

1,6 ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν
ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον
οἰκητήριον εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας
δεσμοῖς αἰδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν,

1,7 ὡς Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ αἱ περὶ
αὐτὰς πόλεις τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τοῦτοις
ἐκπορνεύσασαι καὶ ἀπελθεῖν ὀπίσω
σαρκὸς ἑτέρας,
πρόκεινται δείγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκης
ὑπέχουσαι.

1,8 Ὅμοίως μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι
ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι σάρκα μὲν μιαίνουσιν
κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν

2,4 Εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἀγγέλων
ἀμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο ἀλλὰ
σειραῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν
εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους,
2,5 καὶ ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο
ἀλλὰ ὄγδοον Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα
ἐφύλαξεν κατακλυσμόν κόσμῳ ἀσεβῶν
ἐπάξας,

2,6 καὶ πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας
τεφρώσας [καταστροφῇ] κατέκρινεν

ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβείσιν
θεθεικώς,

2,7 καὶ δίκαιον Λὼτ καταπονούμενον
ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ
ἀναστροφῆς ἐρρυσάτο· * βλέμματι γὰρ
καὶ ἀκοῇ ὁ δίκαιος ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν
αὐτοῖς ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας ψυχὴν
δικαίαν ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν· *
οἶδεν κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμοῦ
ρύεσθαι, ἀδίκους δὲ εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως
κολαζομένους τηρεῖν,

2,10 μάλιστα δὲ τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν
ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ πορευομένους καὶ
κυριότητος καταφρονούντας.

(16) WATSON, *Invention*, 110-111.

Jude 5-7 is a single sentence reminding readers of historical precedents for God's condemnation of sinners, as a prelude to critique of its opponents in v. 8. 2 Pet 2,4-10a revised this material considerably. Apart from what may be an oblique reference to it in 2 Pet 2,1, 2 Peter passed over the precedent in Jude 5. 2 Pet 2,4-10a begins with the precedent in Jude 6, i.e., God's condemnation of the sinful angels. Jude 5-7 simply narrates its precedents; 2 Pet 2,4-10a incorporates them into a long and elaborate conditional sentence. After beginning "If God" in v. 4, there follow three conditional clauses in vv. 4, 5 and 6-8; vv. 9-10 (which incorporate part of Jude 8) provide the conclusion, "then the Lord"⁽¹⁷⁾. In this way the author of 2 Peter transformed Jude's list of precedents for punishment of sinners and critique of its opponents, into a refutation of the false teachers' denial of a final judgment. At the same time this refutation served as a warning that the false teachers will be condemned. The author of 2 Peter began 2,4-10a with the word "for" to indicate that this section is the basis for the assertion in 2,3b that the condemnation of the false teachers is not idle or asleep.

The first two conditional clauses in vv. 4 and 5, have the same verb, "If God did not spare". In v. 4 the author speaks about God's not sparing the angels, in v. 5 about God's not sparing the ancient world at the time of the flood. The former is taken from Jude 6. The author of 2 Peter added the latter, both because it serves his present purpose, and because it prepares for a reference to the flood in 3,5-6. The author may also have added it in view of the following reference to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (2 Pet 2,6). The two constitute precedents for destruction of the world by water and fire (cf. 2 Pet 3,5-7)⁽¹⁸⁾.

Jude 6 describes the angels in two participial phrases as ones "who did not keep their own position, but left their proper dwelling", referring to Genesis 6,1-4 as elaborated in extra-biblical writings like *1 Enoch*⁽¹⁹⁾. 2 Pet 2,4 replaced these phrases with a single participle describing the angels as ones who had sinned. This gives much less information about exactly what they did wrong, but also makes the reason for their condemnation (i.e., their sin) clearer to someone who

⁽¹⁷⁾ According to Bauckham (*Jude, 2 Peter*, 246-47) and Neyrey (*2 Peter, Jude*, 196-197), the author of 2 Peter here relies not only on Jude but also on the tradition that underlies Jude. This tradition also underlies Sir 16,6-23.

⁽¹⁸⁾ FORNBERG, *Early Church*, 41; BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 252; WATSON, *Invention*, 113.

⁽¹⁹⁾ For a parallel to this language see *1 Enoch* 12,4.

does not recognize the story to which reference is being made. The author of 2 Peter may have been trying to minimize reference to non-biblical literature⁽²⁰⁾.

Jude 6 says that God “has kept [the angels] in eternal chains in deepest darkness for the judgment of the great day”⁽²¹⁾. 2 Pet 2,4 says that God “cast the angels into hell and committed them to chains of deepest darkness to be kept until the judgment”. The author of 2 Peter changed the main verb of the clause from “kept” to “committed”, perhaps to emphasize that God was responsible for putting the angels in chains, not merely for keeping them there. The author of 2 Peter made this still more emphatic by adding a participle to say that God cast the angels into hell⁽²²⁾. 2 Peter used a different word for “chains” than that used in Jude 6, and eliminated the adjective “eternal”, perhaps because the idea that the chains are eternal conflicts with the idea that the angels are subject to judgment in the future. 2 Peter also changed “chains in deepest darkness” into “chains of deepest darkness”, suggesting that the chains were not literal chains, but that the chains consisted of darkness⁽²³⁾. 2 Peter changed the main verb of Jude 6, i.e., “kept”, into a participle, using it to say that God was keeping the angels for judgment. The author of 2 Peter omitted the phrase “of the great day”, which modifies judgment in Jude 6. Perhaps he thought it added nothing to the meaning.

2 Peter’s second conditional clause (v. 5) cites the precedent of the flood, “[If God] did not spare the ancient world”. This obviously provided another precedent for God’s punishment of evildoers. However, it also allowed 2 Peter to introduce a precedent for God’s salvation of the righteous, i.e., the salvation of Noah and his family. This precedent is not found in Jude.

2 Peter’s third conditional clause (v. 6-8) cites the precedent of Sodom and Gomorrah, “[If God] condemned them”. Jude 7 says

⁽²⁰⁾ KELLY, *Epistles*, 331.

⁽²¹⁾ This echoes *1 Enoch* 10:4. 6.11-14; 22:11; 91:15.

⁽²²⁾ He also makes use of a Greek verb, *ταρταρόω* = cast into hell, that is reminiscent of the Greek myth of the Titans who were cast into hell, though he probably derives its use from Hellenistic Jewish authors (KELLY, *Epistles*, 331; BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 249). Neyrey says this usage suggests that 2 Peter was written for a multi-cultural audience (*2 Peter, Jude*, 198, 202).

⁽²³⁾ BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 249. Fornberg argues that 2 Peter 2,4 says that the angels were committed to pits (*σπῳίς*) of deepest darkness, rather than chains (*σειρῳίς*). He further argues that *σπῳίς* is “religious vocabulary originally derived from the Eleusinian Mysteries” (*Early Church*, 53).

“Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding cities, which, in the same manner as they [i.e., the angels], indulged in sexual immorality and pursued other flesh, serve as an example by undergoing a punishment of eternal fire”. 2 Peter omitted any reference to other cities and to the specific nature of their sin. The latter is mentioned in general terms in 2,7 and then taken up in 2,10, which we will discuss below. The author of 2 Peter changed the main verb of Jude 7 from “serve” to “condemned”, making it clear that God was responsible for the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. 2 Peter changed the description of the destruction from “undergoing a punishment of eternal fire” to “having turned [them] to ashes”. Perhaps the author thought this was a more accurate description of the fate of the two cities. 2 Peter rewrote Jude’s “serve as an example” as “made them an example of what is coming to the ungodly”; this makes more explicit both that God is the one who made an example of Sodom and Gomorrah and how they function as an example. The author of 2 Peter replaced “serve” with the participle “made”, and used a slightly different word for “example”.

The second part of 2 Peter’s third conditional clause (vv. 7-8) cites the precedent of Lot. This is another precedent for God’s salvation of the righteous. God saved the righteous Lot from the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. The salvation of Lot is not mentioned in Jude⁽²⁴⁾.

The main, concluding clause of this long sentence begins in 2 Pet 2,9. If the preceding clauses are true (vv. 4-8), then God obviously knows how to rescue the godly and punish the unrighteous. The conclusion has no counterpart in Jude. However, the author of 2 Peter used material from Jude 7-8 to develop the second part of this conclusion in v. 10a. Here the author describes the unrighteous in more detail and strongly implies that the false teachers are among them. To do this the author rewrote Jude 8. Jude 8 describes its opponents as dreamers who “also defile the flesh, reject authority, and slander the glorious ones”. 2 Pet 2,10a omitted description of the opponents as “dreamers”; probably it was not appropriate as a description of the false teachers. In 2 Pet 2,10a the author replaced the first two clauses of Jude 8 with participial phrases. The author of 2 Peter replaced the first clause of Jude 8 with a participial phrase taken from Jude 7. The latter described Sodom and Gomorrah as having gone after other flesh. In 2 Pet 2,10a the author replaced the aorist participle with the present

(24) Noah and Lot are also linked in Luke 17,26-30.

participle of a synonymous verb, making the phrase a description of ongoing behavior. He also eliminated the adjective “other”; this was appropriate to describe the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah (and of the angels), but was apparently not suited to describe the sin of the false teachers. The author of 2 Peter added the prepositional phrase “in desire of defilement”. This makes more explicit the meaning of going after flesh. It also uses a noun, “defilement”, that is cognate with the verb “defile” used in Jude 8.

The second clause of Jude 8 says that the opponents “reject authority”. 2 Pet 2,10a replaced “reject” with “despise”. Perhaps the author of 2 Peter thought that Jude’s language conceded too much power to the opponents; or perhaps “despise” simply fit his situation better.

Thus 2 Pet 2,4-10a is a thorough revision of Jude 5-8a. Passing over Jude 5, 2 Peter incorporated Jude 6-8a into a long conditional sentence consisting of three conditional clauses (vv. 4-8) and a conclusion (vv. 9-10a). The historical precedents cited in Jude 6-7, 2 Peter fashioned into two of the three conditional clauses; to these the author added a third. In this way 2 Peter created a list of precedents supporting the conclusion that God both punishes the unrighteous and rescues the godly. 2 Peter used the first part of Jude 8 to describe the false teachers it opposes as unrighteous.

3. Jude 8b-11 / 2 Pet 2,10b-16

δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν.

1,9 Ὁ δὲ Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, ὅτε τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωϋσέως σώματος, οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας ἀλλὰ εἶπεν· ἐπιτιμῆσαι σοι κύριος.

1,10 Οὗτοι δὲ ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἶδασιν βλασφημοῦσιν, ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα ἐπίστανται, ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται.

τολμηταὶ ἀνθάδεις, δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες,
2,11 ὅπου ἄγγελοι ἰσχύι καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες οὐ φέρουσιν κατ’ αὐτῶν παρὰ κυρίου βλάσφημον κρίσιν.

2,12 Οὗτοι δὲ ὡς ἄλογα ζῶα γεγεννημένα φυσικῶς εἰς ἄλωσιν καὶ φθοράν ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημοῦντες, ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρῇσονται

2,13 ἀδικούμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας, ἡδονὴν ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφῇ, σπῖλοι καὶ μῶμοι ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν συνευωχούμενοι ὑμῖν,

2,14 ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος καὶ ἀκαταπαύστους ἀμαρτίας, δελεάζοντες ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτους, καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας ἔχοντες, κατάρκας τέκνα·

1,11 οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς, ὅτι τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Καὶν
ἐπορεύθησαν καὶ τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ
Βαλαάμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν καὶ τῇ
ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κόρε ἀπώλοντο.

2,15 καταλείποντες εὐθεῖαν ὁδὸν
ἐπλανήθησαν, ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ
ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαάμ τοῦ Βοσόρ, ὅς μισθὸν
ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν

2,16 ἔλεγξιν δὲ ἔσχεν ἰδίας παρανομίας·
ὑποζύγιον ἄφωνον ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ
φθεγγόμενον ἐκώλυσεν τὴν τοῦ
προφήτου παραφρονίαν.

The third clause of Jude 8 says that the opponents “slander the glorious ones”. Jude 9 then mentions an incident when the archangel Michael refrained from a judgment of slander. In 2 Pet 2,10b-11 the author separated the final clause of Jude 8 from the previous two clauses, revised it, made it the beginning of a new sentence, and incorporated a revised version of Jude 9 into this sentence. One reason for this may have been to make explicit the implicit connection between Jude 8b and 9.

The author of 2 Peter expanded Jude 8b, emphasizing the audacity of the behavior described: “bold and willful, they are not afraid to slander the glorious ones”. The author of 2 Peter added two adjectives to describe the false teachers, i.e., bold and willful. The word “bold” is probably taken from Jude 9⁽²⁵⁾. 2 Peter replaced “slander”, the main verb of Jude 8b, with “they are not afraid”, implying that the false teachers should fear to behave as they do. 2 Peter then converted “slander” into a participle and used it to describe the behavior of the false teachers as slandering the glorious ones.

Jude 9 describes a specific incident when the archangel Michael was not bold to bring a judgment of slander against the devil. This contrasts with the behavior of Jude’s opponents as described in vv. 8 and 10. The author of 2 Peter rewrote this in much more general terms and incorporated it into the sentence begun in v. 10b in order to make the contrast with the behavior described there sharper. 2 Pet 2,10b says that the false teachers are not afraid to slander the glorious ones; v. 11 says that the angels do not bring a slanderous judgment against them, i.e., either the glorious ones or the false teachers⁽²⁶⁾.

2 Peter replaced the reference to Michael the archangel with a reference to angels in general and omitted the clause in Jude that

⁽²⁵⁾ BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 260; NEYREY, *2 Peter, Jude*, 208.

⁽²⁶⁾ Bauckham (*Jude, 2 Peter*, 261) opts for the former. Perkins interprets 2 Peter 2,11 as a statement that the angels do not bring the blasphemous judgments of the opponents into the heavenly court as evidence against them (*First and Second Peter*, 184).

describes the occasion when Michael did not bring a judgment of slander against the devil, i.e., when the two contended over the body of Moses. For some reason the specific incident mentioned by Jude did not serve 2 Peter's purpose, and the author replaced it with a reference to the behavior of angels in general. Having used the adjective "bold" in 2,10b, the author of 2 Peter omitted the cognate verb "dare" from the main clause of Jude 9 and replaced it with "bring". In addition, as Fornberg observes, the author of 2 Peter changed the tense of the main verb from the aorist of Jude 9 to present tense, transforming a reference to a specific incident into a description of repeated behavior. The author of 2 Peter also changed the quotation of Michael's words into the phrase "from the Lord"⁽²⁷⁾. Bauckham adds that the author of 2 Peter replaced Jude's implication that the judgment of slander would be against the devil with the statement that it would be "against them"⁽²⁸⁾.

The author of 2 Peter may have made these changes because he was unfamiliar with the incident mentioned in Jude 9⁽²⁹⁾ or wary of referring to an incident not recorded in the bible, and found only in apocryphal writings⁽³⁰⁾. Or perhaps an incident in which Michael refrained from bringing a judgment of slander against the devil did not form a sufficient contrast to the behavior of the false teachers described in 2 Pet 2,10b. The author adds that the angels are "greater in might and power", either than the false teachers or than the glorious ones⁽³¹⁾, in order to sharpen the contrast between the false teachers and the angels. The author of 2 Peter changed Jude's "condemnation of slander" into "slandorous judgment" in order to make the meaning of the phrase clearer⁽³²⁾. All of this made the behavior of the angels a clear contrast to that of the false teachers. However, the reader remains uncertain on what basis the author describes the behavior of the angels in this way.

Jude 10-11 are a further criticism of Jude's opponents. 2 Pet 2,12-16 is an adaptation of this material to continue 2 Peter's description of the false teachers, begun in 2 Pet 2,10. Jude 10 criticizes the opponents

⁽²⁷⁾ FORNBERG, *Early Church*, 54.

⁽²⁸⁾ BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 261.

⁽²⁹⁾ BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 260.

⁽³⁰⁾ KELLY, *Epistles*, 338; Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, 208.

⁽³¹⁾ Kelly (*Epistles*, 338) and Fornberg (*Early Church*, 54) argue for the latter. Bauckham (*Jude, 2 Peter*, 262) regards it as "slightly more natural".

⁽³²⁾ BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 261.

in two carefully constructed parallel clauses: “these slander whatever they do not understand, and they are destroyed by those things that, like irrational animals, they know by instinct”. 2 Pet 2,12 revised this to emphasize the comparison with irrational animals⁽³³⁾. The author of 2 Peter put this comparison first. He inserted the phrase “like irrational animals”, from the second clause of Jude 10, immediately after “these”, giving prominence to the assertion that the false teachers are like irrational animals. The author also changed the adverb “by instinct”, from the second clause of Jude 10, into an adjective, “of instinct”, and used it to describe irrational animals. He then described them further as having a very limited purpose — “born to be caught and killed”. The author of 2 Peter converted “slander”, the main verb of Jude 10’s first clause, into a participle and used it to describe the false teachers as slandering what they do not understand. 2 Peter also replaced Jude 10’s words for “whatever they do not understand” with synonyms.

Finally the author says, “in their destruction they also will be destroyed”. This is 2 Peter’s revision of the second clause of Jude 10. Having already used “by instinct” and the comparison with irrational animals, the author of 2 Peter omitted Jude 10’s statement that the opponents do know some things. The remainder of Jude 10’s second clause says “by these they are destroyed”. The author of 2 Peter changed the tense of the verb from present to future and replaced “by these” with “in their destruction”. The antecedent of “their” is unclear; the most likely possibilities are that it refers to the irrational animals, or that it refers to the ones slandered by the false teachers⁽³⁴⁾. This seems less clear than the text of Jude that underlies it; however, Jude’s statement that the opponents are destroyed by the things they know by instinct is far from transparent. Repetition of the root meaning “destruction” (φθορ- / φθαρ-) three times in 2 Pet 2,12 is paronomasia. 2 Peter 2,13a further describes the future destruction of the false teachers as “suffering the penalty for doing wrong”. Repetition of the root meaning “wrongdoing” (ἁδικ-) twice in this verse is another example of paronomasia.

The remainder of 2 Pet 2,13-14 is further description of the false teachers. The author of 2 Peter took the description of them as “blots” and as “feasting with” the readers from Jude 12, using a cognate of the

⁽³³⁾ Fornberg argues that the purpose of this revision is to deny “all understanding to the adversaries” (*Early Church*, 48-49).

⁽³⁴⁾ BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 263-264.

word for “blots” in Jude 12⁽³⁵⁾. Otherwise, this material has no counterpart in Jude. In 2 Pet 2,13 the author coupled “blots”, taken from Jude, with blemishes, and so prepared for his use of the phrase “without blot or blemish” in 3,14. Bauckham thinks that the phrase “indulging in their deceits (ἀπάταις) while they feast with you” may contain a pun on Jude 12 — “blots on your love feasts (ἀγάπαις), feasting with you”⁽³⁶⁾. Senior suggests that the author of 2 Peter changed love feasts to deceits either because love feasts were not a custom in the churches he addresses, or because they had not been abused by his opponents⁽³⁷⁾. Perkins suggests that 2 Peter is trying to obviate any suspicion that the feasting occurs at formal celebrations of the Christian church⁽³⁸⁾.

2 Pet 2,15 is an adaptation of Jude 11. Jude 11 compares the opponents to Cain, Balaam and Korah. 2 Peter omitted any reference to the first and third, though it adapted the image of the “way” from Jude’s reference to Cain⁽³⁹⁾. The description of the false teachers as accursed children at the end of 2 Pet 2,14 may also have been suggested by Jude’s reference to Cain, the accursed child of Adam and Eve (Gen 4,11). The author may have thought it more effective to make a single comparison at greater length, than three very brief comparisons. In addition comparison with Balaam may have been particularly appropriate following an accusation that the false teachers are greedy⁽⁴⁰⁾. Senior suggests that the author of 2 Peter focused on Balaam because “his credentials as prophet and wise man fit the false teachers”⁽⁴¹⁾.

Jude 11 says of the opponents that “they went the way of Cain and abandoned themselves to Balaam’s error for the sake of gain”. 2 Pet 2,15 says of the false teachers, “Having left the straight way, they have erred, having followed the way of Balaam, son of Bosor, who loved the gain of wrongdoing”. Using the word “way” twice in different cases is polyptoton. Jude 11 says that the opponents have gone the way of Cain; 2 Pet 2,15 expressed a similar idea more generally and in negative terms, i.e., the false teachers have left the straight way. This

⁽³⁵⁾ KELLY, *Epistles*, 341; FORNBERG, *Early Church*, 49-50; BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 265-66; NEYREY, *2 Peter, Jude*, 209-210.

⁽³⁶⁾ BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 260, 266; so also WATSON, *Invention*, 117.

⁽³⁷⁾ SENIOR, *1 and 2 Peter*, 124.

⁽³⁸⁾ PERKINS, *First and Second Peter*, 185.

⁽³⁹⁾ BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 267; NEYREY, *2 Peter, Jude*, 210.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 260.

⁽⁴¹⁾ SENIOR, *1 and 2 Peter*, 125; cf. FORNBERG, *Early Church*, 39-40.

refers back to the language of 2 Pet 2,2 and anticipates a similar statement in 2,21. Jude 11 says that the opponents abandoned themselves to Balaam's error for the sake of gain. The author of 2 Peter replaced "abandoned themselves to error" with "have erred", using a verb cognate to the noun "error" found in Jude 11. The author then explained how they have gone astray with the phrase "having followed the way of Balaam". This phrase is patterned on Jude 11's statement that the opponents followed the way of Cain. The author of 2 Peter then transformed Jude 11's statement that the opponents acted for the sake of gain in following Balaam into a description of Balaam as one "who loved the gain of wrongdoing". To this 2 Peter added 2,16, describing the rebuke of Balaam for his transgression. Jude says nothing about this.

Thus 2 Pet 2,10b-16 is a thorough revision of Jude 8b-11. In 2 Pet 2,10b-11 the author separated the final clause of Jude 8 from the preceding two clauses and joined to it a revised version of Jude 9. In 2 Pet 2,12 the author followed Jude 10 more closely, though still making substantial changes. The author of 2 Peter added 2,13-14, making some use of Jude 12. In 2 Pet 2,15 the author used one of the three elements of Jude 11. He expanded upon it and developed it further by the addition of 2 Pet 2,16. From a rhetorical point of view, one can say that here and in the following section of 2 Peter, the author reworked a portion of Jude that attempted to prove Jude's thesis, into a digression in which the author of 2 Peter denounced his opponents ⁽⁴²⁾.

4. Jude 12-16 / 2 Pet 2,17-22

1,12 Οὐτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαῖ
ὑμῶν σπλάδες συννευχόμενοι
ἀφόβως, ἐαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες,
νεφέλαι ἄνυδροι ὑπὸ ἀνέμων
παραφερόμεναι, δένδρα φθινοπωρινὰ
ἄκαρπα δις ἀποθανόντα ἐκρίζωθέντα,

1,13 κύματα ἄγρια θαλάσσης
ἐπαφρίζοντα τὰς ἐαυτῶν αἰσχύνας,
ἀστέρες πλανῆται
οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα
τετήρηται.

1,14 Προεφήτευσεν δὲ καὶ τούτοις
ἑβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ· Ἐνῶχ λέγων· ἰδοὺ
ἦλθεν κύριος ἐν ἀγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ

2,17 οὐτοί εἰσιν

πηγαὶ ἄνυδροι καὶ ὀμίχλαι ὑπὸ
λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι,

οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους τετήρηται.

⁽⁴²⁾ Watson, *Invention*, 48-49, 114-115.

1,15 ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων καὶ
ἐλέγξαι πᾶσαν ψυχὴν περὶ πάντων τῶν
ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ὧν ἡσέβησαν
καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ὧν
ἐλάλησαν κατ' αὐτοῦ ἀμαρτωλοὶ
ἀσεβεῖς.

1,16 Οὗτοί εἰσιν γογγυσταὶ
μεμψίμοιροι κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας
ἐαυτῶν πορευόμενοι, καὶ τὸ στόμα
αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα, θαυμάζοντ' ἐν
πρόσωπα ὠφελεῖα χάριν.

2,18 ὑπέρογκα γὰρ ματαιότητος
φθεγγόμενοι δελεάζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις
σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις τοὺς ὀλίγως
ἀποφεύγοντας τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ
ἀναστρεφόμενους,

2 Pet 2,19 ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, αὐτοὶ δοῦλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς· ὃ
γάρ τις ἦττηται, τούτῳ δεδούλωται.

2,20 εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου [ἡμῶν] καὶ
σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τούτοις δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες ἡττῶνται, γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ
ἔσχατα χεῖρονα τῶν πρώτων.

2,21 κρεῖττον γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἢ ἐπιγνοῦσιν
ὑποστρέψαι ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἀγίας ἐντολῆς.

2,22 συμβέβηκεν αὐτοῖς τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας· κύων ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον
ἐξέραμα, καὶ ὅς λουσαμένη εἰς κυλισμὸν βορβόρου.

In 2,17-22 the author of 2 Peter continues the description of the false teachers begun in vv. 10b-16. In vv. 17-22 the author made highly selective use of Jude 12-16. Jude 12-13 consists of five brief descriptions of the opponents. 2 Peter adapted the first of these (“blemishes on your love-feasts, feasting with you without fear, feeding themselves”) in 2,13. The remaining four descriptions are metaphors drawn from the natural world⁽⁴³⁾. 2 Pet 2,17 is an adaptation of the first and fourth; the second and third are completely omitted. 2 Pet 2,17 begins with the words, “These are”, taken from the beginning of Jude 12.

The first of Jude’s four metaphors describes the opponents as “waterless clouds carried along by the winds”. 2 Pet 2,17 changed the waterless clouds to “waterless springs” and added “mists driven by a storm”. Perhaps the author of 2 Peter thought that waterless springs was better than waterless clouds as a metaphor for lack of productivity⁽⁴⁴⁾. Having changed the clouds into springs, the author of 2 Peter could no longer say that they were carried along by the winds. So he introduced a second metaphor of his own, i.e., mists, and described them as driven by a storm. Jude’s image suggests that the opponents have no direction of their own, but are moved this way and

⁽⁴³⁾ Bauckham (*Jude, 2 Peter*, 90-91) says that these metaphors may have been suggested by *1 Enoch* 2:1–5:4 and 80:2-8.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ KELLY, *Epistles*, 344-45. According to Watson, “waterless springs” is a traditional metaphor; he cites Jer 2,13 (*Invention*, 120).

that by external forces. 2 Peter's image suggests that the false teachers are controlled by a powerful external force that directs their actions. This may have conveyed the author's view of the false teachers better than Jude's language did.

2 Pet 2,17 omitted the second, third and fourth metaphors in Jude 12-13. Either the author of 2 Peter did not find these helpful as a description of the false teachers, or he did not think such a multiplication of images was effective⁽⁴⁵⁾. Although 2 Peter did not use the fourth metaphor, i.e., "wandering stars", it did use the description of these wandering stars in Jude 13 as ones "for whom the deepest darkness has been reserved forever". 2 Pet 2,17 omitted "forever", but otherwise quoted this verbatim. This is the longest quotation from Jude in 2 Peter thus far.

Jude 14-15 continues to describe the opponents by saying that they are the fulfillment of a passage from *1 Enoch* that is cited, i.e., *1 Enoch* 1:9. 2 Peter omitted this, perhaps in order to avoid the citation of a writing not found in the bible. Fornberg argues that 2 Peter omitted this citation because it speaks of a past event and thus "could not be used against those who denied the parousia of Christ"⁽⁴⁶⁾. Fornberg also suggests that *1 Enoch* may not have been known to the Gentile readers of 2 Peter and that it would have been "dangerous" to seek support from it. And the citation mentions only the negative not the positive aspect of judgment; both were of interest to the author of 2 Peter⁽⁴⁷⁾.

Jude 16 continues to describe the opponents in two clauses as "grumblers and malcontents, they indulge their own lusts; they are bombastic in speech, flattering people to their own advantage". 2 Pet 2,18 begins with an adaptation of the second clause. The author of 2 Peter transformed Jude's statement that the opponents' mouth speaks bombast, into a participial phrase, i.e., "speaking bombast"; he uses a different word meaning "speak", once again displaying a preference

⁽⁴⁵⁾ According to Bauckham, the author of 2 Peter probably thought these metaphors were redundant (*Jude, 2 Peter*, 272). According to Watson (*Invention*, 183-184) the author of 2 Peter might not have used the images because he was following rhetorical conventions of not crowding metaphors, avoiding a series of metaphors of the same species, or avoiding use of more than three metaphors in a row. However, the overall style of 2 Peter makes Watson think it unlikely that this was the author's motivation. 2 Peter 2,13-22 violates these conventions (*Invention*, 123-124).

⁽⁴⁶⁾ FORNBERG, *Early Church*, 47.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ FORNBERG, *Early Church*, 56.

for unusual vocabulary. He also added the qualifier “worthless” to make the emptiness of their speech more explicit. He omitted the participial phrase with which the second clause of Jude 16 ends. The author of 2 Peter then adapted the first clause of Jude 16, i.e., the statement that the opponents are grumblers and malcontents who indulge their own desires, into a statement that the false teachers use licentious desires of the flesh to “entice people who have just escaped from those who live in error”. The author of 2 Pet took only the word “desires” from Jude. By adding the conjunction “for” at the beginning of 2,18, the author of 2 Peter connected this material to the preceding description of his opponents, so that it became the basis for that description. 2 Pet 2,17-19 thus forms an enthymeme⁽⁴⁸⁾, i.e., a syllogism in which one of the premises is implicit.

In 2,19-22 the author of 2 Peter went on to describe the false teachers as ones who tempt Christians to return to the condition from which they have been saved. This material is not found in Jude.

Thus 2 Pet 2,17-22 made use of parts of Jude 12-16. 2 Pet 2,17 adapted the first and fourth of four metaphors found in Jude 12-13, but omitted the second and third. 2 Peter omitted Jude 14-15, but adapted Jude 16 to serve as the premise for 2,17 and the introduction to a long denunciation of the false teachers for causing Christians to turn back to their pre-Christian state. One element of this is no doubt abandonment of vivid expectation that Jesus will come again.

5. Jude 17-18 / 2 Pet 3,1-3

1,17 ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί, μνησθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

1,18 ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν· [ὅτι] ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου [τοῦ] χρόνου ἔσονται ἐμπαῖκται κατὰ τὰς ἐαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι τῶν ἀσεβειῶν.

3,1 Ταύτην ἤδη, ἀγαπητοί, δευτέραν ὑμῖν γράφω ἐπιστολήν, ἐν αἷς διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινῆ διάνοιαν

3,2 μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος,

3,3 τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες ὅτι ἐλεύσονται ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν [ἐν] ἐμπαγμονῇ ἐμπαῖκται κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι

2 Pet 3,1-3 begins the author’s most direct argument against the doctrine of the false teachers. The author has adapted Jude 17-18 for

⁽⁴⁸⁾ WATSON, *Invention*, 120.

this purpose. This is another point at which 2 Peter has quoted Jude at some length, though with significant changes.

2 Pet 3,1 does not derive from Jude 17-18, except, perhaps, the address “beloved” from Jude 17⁽⁴⁹⁾. 2 Pet 3,1 identifies 2 Peter as a second letter from Peter and begins to state its purpose. This is a transition back to the main argument of the letter, made necessary by the digression in 2,10b-22⁽⁵⁰⁾.

2 Pet 3,2-3 is adapted from Jude 17-18. Jude 17 tells the readers to “remember the predictions of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ”. In connecting this to 3,1, 2 Peter changed the imperative “remember” to an infinitive. More significantly, 2 Peter changed what the readers should remember from one thing into two things. Jude 17 said that the readers should remember the words spoken in the past by the apostles. 2 Pet 3,2 says they should remember “the words spoken in the past by the holy prophets”. To this 2 Pet 3,2 added that they should remember “the commandment of the Lord and savior spoken through your apostles”. 2 Peter added a reference to the prophets in line with the view, expressed in 1,19-21, that the second coming of Jesus fulfills prophecy. The commandment spoken through the apostles is the same as that mentioned in 2,21⁽⁵¹⁾, i.e., the commandment that the followers of Jesus live a holy life in expectation of Jesus’ return (cf. 2 Pet 3,11-12).

The author of 2 Peter inserted the participle “spoken in the past” between the article and the noun, rather than attaching it by repeating the article as Jude had. The author of 2 Peter inserted “the holy prophets” after “by”, making them the source of the word spoken in the past instead of the apostles. The author then added a second object of the verb remember, i.e., “the commandment”. This made “the apostles” possessors of the commandment; the author of 2 Peter added the specification that they are “your” apostles. The purpose of this, and of attributing the words spoken in the past to prophets rather than apostles, may be to make these words suitable for a letter from the apostle Peter. In Jude 17 the phrase “of our Lord Jesus Christ” modifies “apostles”. The author of 2 Peter omitted “our” and “Jesus Christ” and replaced these words with “and savior”. “The Lord and savior” then became a second possessor of the commandment. This is awkward. The author of 2 Peter does not seem to have revised Jude thoroughly enough at this point.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ KELLY, *Epistles*, 354.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ WATSON, *Invention*, 124-126.

⁽⁵¹⁾ KELLY, *Epistles*, 354; WATSON, *Invention*, 126.

Jude 18 contains a direct quotation of the predictions of the apostles, "In the last time there will be scoffers, indulging their own ungodly lusts". 2 Pet 3,3 is an adaptation of this. In Jude the quotation spells out what the readers are to remember. 2 Peter has transformed it into an additional point made by Peter himself⁽⁵²⁾. The author of 2 Peter replaced the formula with which Jude introduced the quotation, i.e., "for they said to you", with the statement that the readers must first know this; what they must know is an adaptation of Jude's quotation.

2 Peter changed the verb from "there will be" to "there will come" and put it first in the sentence. 2 Peter changed "in the last time" to "in the last days"; Bauckham observes that the latter is the more familiar expression⁽⁵³⁾. Before mentioning the scoffers, 2 Peter inserted the phrase "with scoffing". Bauckham sees this as an imitation of the style of the Septuagint⁽⁵⁴⁾. It is also another example of paronomasia. 2 Peter followed Jude 18 closely in describing the scoffers as "indulging their own lusts". However, 2 Peter used a different word for "their own" than Jude 18 did, and 2 Peter omitted "ungodly". All of these changes seem to reflect stylistic preferences on the part of 2 Peter. 2 Peter then went on in 3,4 to a direct quotation of the content of the false teaching, after which 2 Peter refuted it.

Thus 2 Pet 3,1-3 is an adaptation of Jude 17-18. 2 Pet 3,1 does not derive from Jude. But 2 Pet 3,2-3 is virtually a quotation of Jude 17-18. However, the author of 2 Peter made many small changes in this material to make it better serve his purpose and to reflect his stylistic preferences.

*
* *

We began by noting that in adapting Jude the author of 2 Peter transformed Jude's critique of the behavior of its opponents into a critique of opponents who will not only behave improperly, but also teach falsely, i.e., deny that Jesus will come again. 2 Peter also transformed Jude's critique of present opponents into a prediction that opponents will arise in the future.

⁽⁵²⁾ BAUCKHAM (*Jude, 2 Peter*, 283) suggests that the author of 2 Peter here transforms Jude's quotation of the apostles into a direct statement of the apostle Peter. So also WATSON, *Invention*, 127 n. 325.

⁽⁵³⁾ *Jude, 2 Peter*, 288.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ *Jude, 2 Peter*, 289. So also WATSON, *Invention*, 127.

The author of 2 Peter accomplished these transformations partly by incorporating the material taken from Jude into a larger structure, sandwiching it between 2 Pet 1 and 2 Pet 3,4-18. This is part of what gave new meaning to the Jude material. Many of the changes the author of 2 Peter made in the Jude material itself were designed to aid this incorporation. This is especially true in 2 Pet 2,1-3 and 3,1-3. But it can also be seen in such things as the addition of a reference to Noah in 2 Pet 2,5 and the phrase “blots and blemishes” in 2 Pet 2,13, both of which anticipate 2 Pet 3.

The author of 2 Peter also accomplished this transformation by means of other changes in the material he took from Jude. We noted that 2 Pet 2,1 changed the aorist of Jude 4 into future tense. 2 Pet 2,1-3 also revised Jude 4 in various ways to make it a critique of false teachers. 2 Pet 2,4-10a revised Jude 5-8a into an elaborate refutation of the doctrine of the false teachers. 2 Pet 2,10b-22 revised Jude 8b-16, which criticizes the behavior of its opponents, into a critique both of the behavior of the false teachers and of their malign effect on others. Jude 17-18 argues that the rise of its opponents had been predicted; 2 Pet 3,1-3 revised this to make the same point concerning the false teachers.

In addition to adapting the material of Jude 4-18 to a different purpose than it had in Jude, other motives were probably at work in 2 Peter’s alteration of this material. The author of 2 Peter may have wanted to eliminate references to extra-biblical literature. The author seems to have wanted to clarify obscurities in the Jude material. He did this both by the addition of words and phrases and by making the connections of the argument more explicit, as he does in 2 Pet 2,10b-11 and 18. However, unsurprisingly, his revision is at times more obscure than the Jude material with which he began. This is especially true in 2,10b-16. The author of 2 Peter also seems to have wanted to revise the Jude material in accordance with his own stylistic preferences, especially the use of unusual vocabulary and the introduction of figures of speech.

It may illuminate 2 Peter’s use of Jude to compare it briefly to other instances of literary dependence in early Christian literature ⁽⁵⁵⁾. An instance of such dependence that at times approximates simple quotation can be seen in Matthew and Luke’s use of Q (or Matthew or Luke’s use of the other). For example, Matt 4,3-10 / Luke 4,3-12

⁽⁵⁵⁾ For a discussion of the way Hellenistic authors used predecessors see H.J. CADBURY, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (London 1961) 155-183.

displays a much greater degree of verbatim agreement than does Jude 4-18 / 2 Pet 2,1-3,3, though there are also many differences between Matthew and Luke at this point. Most of all they differ in the order of the second and third temptations.

The use of Heb 1,3-13 by 1 Clem 36.2-5 (or the reverse) is quite similar to the relationship between Jude and 2 Peter. In 36.2 the author of 1 Clement takes the first phrase of Heb 1,3 and joins it to a slightly altered version of Heb 1,4. In 36.3-5 the author of 1 Clement cites Pss 104,4; 2,7; and 110,1, which are cited in Heb 1,7.5 and 13 respectively. In this way the author of 1 Clement uses the material of Hebrews selectively to make a slightly different point than that made by Hebrews.

Literary dependence of 2 Thessalonians on 1 Thessalonians has often been suggested. If this is the case, the relationship between them is more distant than the relationship between Jude and 2 Peter. 2 Thess 1,1-2a is almost identical to 1 Thess 1,1; 2 Thess 3,8b is almost identical to 1 Thess 2,9b; and 2 Thess 3,18 is almost identical to 1 Thess 5,28. This is somewhat more verbatim agreement than we find in the relationship between Jude and 2 Peter. What is absent is use of the argument of 1 Thessalonians by 2 Thessalonians. It is sometimes argued that the double thanksgiving in 2 Thess 1,3; 2,13 is based on that of 1 Thess 1,2; 2,13, and that the benediction of 2 Thess 2,16-17 is based on that of 1 Thess 3,11-13. But even if that is the case, it indicates use of the formal elements of 1 Thessalonians by 2 Thessalonians, not use of its content.

Athenaeum of Ohio
6616 Beechmont Avenue
Cincinnati, OH 45230

Terrance CALLAN

SUMMARY

Assuming that 2 Pet 2,1-3,3 is dependent on Jude 4-18, this essay describes in detail the way the author of 2 Peter has used Jude's material. It is clear that the author of 2 Peter has not simply incorporated Jude, as is sometimes asserted. Rather, 2 Peter has thoroughly reworked Jude to serve its own purposes. 2 Pet 2,1-3,3 is best described as a free paraphrase of Jude 4-18. The relationship between the two texts is similar to the relationship between 1 Clem 36.2-5 and Heb 1,3-13.

Who Was Bar Jesus (Acts 13,6-12)? (1)

According to Acts 13, Paul and Barnabas found in Paphos on Cyprus ‘a certain man who was a *magos*, a false prophet, and a Jew, whose name was Bar Jesus’ (ἄνδρα τινὰ μάγον ψευδοπροφήτην Ἰουδαῖον ὄνομα Βαρτησοῦ). This man was with the proconsul, Sergius Paulus, whom Luke calls ‘an intelligent (συνετός) man’ (13,6-7). Fitzmyer believes the description of Bar Jesus ‘borders on the fantastic’ (2), and scholarship in general has tended to see him in very negative terms. He is depicted as being as far removed from the straight paths of the Lord as any pagan magician or any Jewish opponent to the Christian Way. Haenchen, typically, understands this episode as demonstrating “the superiority of Christianity over magic” (3). However, I will suggest that the point of this episode is not a struggle between Christianity and paganism, but a struggle either within a synagogue community to which some Christians belonged or within the Christian movement itself. At issue between Paul and Bar Jesus were the contradictory understandings of righteousness and the way of God. I propose that it was not his magical practices, but his position on these issues that made him, from Luke’s perspective, a threatening opponent of the faith(4).

(1) I wish to thank my colleague, Professor Michael Lattke (University of Queensland), and the Rev. Drs Stephen Haar and John Strelan, for their helpful comments on various drafts of this article.

(2) J. FITZMYER, *The Acts of the Apostles*. A new translation with introduction and commentary (New York 1998) 501.

(3) E. HAENCHEN, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Oxford 1971) 398. Dunn says the episode illustrates ‘the recognition by one who prized magical powers that he stood before one possessed of greater powers’ (J.G.D. DUNN, *Jesus and the Spirit*. A study of the religious and charismatic experience of Jesus and the first Christians as reflected in the New Testament [Grand Rapids, MI 1975] 166).

(4) It could be argued that Bar Jesus in fact was won over to Paul’s side. The similarities noticed by scholars between Paul’s conversion and what happens to Bar Jesus might support this reading. Both are depicted as opponents of the way of God, both are confronted with an unassailable word, both are rendered blind for a short time, both are led by the hand. See S. GARRETT, *The Demise of the Devil*. Magic and the demonic in Luke’s writings (Minneapolis 1989) 84.

1. A *Magos*

The first description given of Bar Jesus is that he was a *magos* (μάγος). Much has been written about the *magoi* and there is no need to repeat the results of that scholarship⁽⁵⁾. The term, of course, originally referred to a Persian caste; but there is no doubt that in later usage it came to be used almost adjectivally of those who had ideas and customs that were foreign to traditional Greek views and customs. To give just one example, Strabo reports that the *magoi* ‘even consort with their mothers’ (*Geog.* 15.3.20). Pliny wanted to “expose their untruths” (*N.H.* 30.1). Not surprisingly, then, among the Greeks, a μάγος became synonymous with a γοής, a charlatan and trickster (Dio Chrysostom, *Disc.* 39.41). From Luke’s perspective, Bar Jesus is a prophet whose interpretation of the will of God is false, and therefore whose authority is foreign to that of the legitimate prophetic circle as represented by Barnabas and Saul. The latter two have been set apart by the Holy Spirit (13,2), sent out by the Holy Spirit (13,4) and are filled with the Holy Spirit (13,9). Bar Jesus, however, has his authority from the adversary. He is, from Luke’s perspective, υἱὸς διαβόλου (13,10).

On the other hand, the identification as *magos* could mean little more than that Bar Jesus was associated with the court of the proconsul as a religious adviser, a position some Jews are known to have held⁽⁶⁾. Josephus makes the specific Jew-*magos* link when referring to a certain Simon, co-incidentally also a Cypriot, and one who, like Bar Jesus, had friends in the Roman consular system (*Ant.* 20.7.2). In addition, the role and function of a *magos* and those of a rabbi, at least in later times, were not at all dissimilar. Both were ‘holy men’, both were men of power and special knowledge, both were involved in decision-making within their respective communities⁽⁷⁾. However, for Luke, the point of the term seems to be that Bar Jesus, despite his name, certainly does not belong to Jesus, but is an outsider, having a

(⁵) In New Testament studies, this work focuses largely on Simon Magus. For a useful bibliography, see J. JERVELL, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen 1998) 258-259. See also the recent work of S. HAAR, *Simon Magus*. The first Gnostic? (Berlin – New York, forthcoming). The understanding of Simon as a *magos* strongly colours the understanding of Bar Jesus as such in many commentaries.

(⁶) Joseph, Daniel, and Ahikar are well-known examples of Jews holding such positions. Compare also Josephus, *Ant.* 8.2.5; 20.7.2.

(⁷) See J. NEUSNER, “Rabbi and Magus in Third-Century Sasanian Babylonia”, *History of Religions* 6 (1966/7) 169-178.

foreign, and therefore invalid, source of authority. The term is used in 13,6 to characterise Bar Jesus as a serious opponent of Paul.

2. A Jew

Bar Jesus is also said to be a Jew (Ἰουδαῖος). Scholars tend to understand this negatively — even as an example of a Lukan anti-Jewish polemic. So J.T. Sanders claims Luke thinks of Bar Jesus as an “evil Jew” who opposes the mission to the gentiles⁽⁸⁾. Barrett includes the term in “everything that Luke did not like”⁽⁹⁾. Bruce calls him “a renegade Jew”⁽¹⁰⁾ because he is a *magos*; and Garrett says he is someone “who by practicing magic commits what Luke regarded as the worst sort of idolatry”⁽¹¹⁾. In other words, the man is consistently portrayed as being completely outside the pale. That, as will be shown, is questionable, but for now it is sufficient to say that an individual being ‘a Jew’ is not always, if ever, viewed negatively by Luke. It is true that Luke uses the plural ‘Jews’ to refer to those who are not Christian, and he uses it precisely in that way in 13,5 where Paul is said to be proclaiming the word of God ‘in the synagogues of the Jews’. However, the fact is that on the great majority of occasions in Acts when Luke identifies an individual as ‘a Jew’, he does so of a Christian. Such is the case with Peter (10,28), Timothy’s mother (16,1), Aquila (18,2), Apollos (18,24), of course with Paul himself (21,39; 22,3), and possibly also with Alexander (19,34). The only exceptions are Scaeva (19,14; but even his sons operate with the name of Jesus) and Drusilla, the wife of Felix, who is quite keen to hear Paul ‘speak about the faith in Jesus Christ’ (24,24). So I doubt that identifying Bar Jesus as a Jew is meant at all to be an anti-Jewish depiction. Nor is it meant to cast him in the outsider category; to the contrary, since Luke commonly uses the category ‘a Jew’ of a *Christian* individual, one could theoretically understand that Bar Jesus was a Christian. It is possible to think of him as an ‘incomplete’ Christian, as indeed was Apollos, a Jew who needed to be instructed more accurately in the way of God (18,26), and were the disciples of Acts 19,1-7. In any case, Bar Jesus was a serious threat, partly because he was so very close to the Jesus movement, and possibly even had an impact on it.

⁽⁸⁾ J.T. SANDERS, *The Jews in Luke-Acts* (London 1987) 259.

⁽⁹⁾ C.K. BARRETT, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Edinburgh 1994) I, 613.

⁽¹⁰⁾ F.F. BRUCE, *The Book of the Acts* (Grand Rapids, MI 1988) 249.

⁽¹¹⁾ GARRETT, *Demise*, 81.

3. A False Prophet

The argument that Bar Jesus was someone bordering closely on the Christian community, if not actually within it, gains momentum from the term, ‘false prophet’. However, rather than seeing this term as identifying him as a genuine prophet, the great majority of scholars read this as an association with paganism and magic. Haenchen, for example, says Luke “must have imagined Bar-Jesus as the proconsul’s court-astrologer, who at the same time claimed to know the magic formulae by which the bonds of fate can be broken”⁽¹²⁾. Thus he is understood to be not only outside of the Christian pale but even also of the Jewish. Pesch also thinks he is representative of a Jewish-heathen syncretism⁽¹³⁾, a view supported by Barrett who thinks that the double description of him as false prophet and *magos* suggests “that he stood on the boundary between Judaism and heathenism”⁽¹⁴⁾. Jervell is one of the few who rejects this notion and insists that he was associated with the synagogue, and was “ein jüdischer Wundertäter; das Wort μάγος reicht nicht aus für die Bezeichnung ‘Synkretismus’”⁽¹⁵⁾. And Schille at least considers the possibility that ‘false prophet’ might be used in the same way as it is used in the Didache, that is, as referring to early Christian charismatic prophets. But he then rejects that idea and prefers to interpret ‘false prophet’ in the sense of a γοῆς. He does so because he identifies Bar Jesus as a magician⁽¹⁶⁾.

Fitzmyer understands the description ‘false prophet’ to mean that Bar Jesus “posed as a prophet”⁽¹⁷⁾. This is misleading and reduces the full impact of this episode. Bar Jesus did not pose as a prophet — he was indeed a prophet, but in Luke’s opinion, a false one. A false prophet made the same claims as the true prophet — both appealed to a divine authority for their pronouncements. It must also be remembered that the claim of Luke and other Christian writers that prophecy was alive and active was basically a Christian claim. Most non-Christian Jews believed that prophecy had ceased altogether in the Second Temple

⁽¹²⁾ HAENCHEN, *Acts*, 398.

⁽¹³⁾ R. PESCH, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Zürich – Neukirchen-Vluyn 1986) II, 21 and 26.

⁽¹⁴⁾ BARRETT, *Acts*, I, 613. Compare also G. STÄHLIN, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen 1975) 176; for others, see JERVELL, *Apostelgeschichte*, 346, n. 416.

⁽¹⁵⁾ JERVELL, *Apostelgeschichte*, 346, n. 416.

⁽¹⁶⁾ G. SCHILLE, *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas* (Berlin 1984) 287.

⁽¹⁷⁾ FITZMYER, *Acts*, 499.

period⁽¹⁸⁾. Josephus, for example, reserved the word ‘prophet’ for the biblical prophets, and had no hesitation in calling those who in his own day claimed to be God’s messengers ‘false prophets’ (for example, *War* 6.5.2). For all that, in Jewish tradition, a prophet claimed to have stood in the council of the Lord; he is one who claims to reveal the will of God. Both true and false prophet claimed this status and function. That the word/will of God and its interpretation was at issue in this Bar Jesus episode is implied by 13,7 as Sergius Paulus “sought to hear the word of God”. This little sentence is crucial in this episode. It indicates the point of conflict between Paul and Bar Jesus — the understanding of “the word of God”. Hearing the word of God is important for Luke (Luke 5,1; Acts 13,44; 15,7) and has blessing attached to it (Luke 8,21; 11,28). It is also characteristic of the prophets of Israel to challenge their audiences with, “Hear the word of God...” (for example, Isa 1,10; Jer 19,3; Ezek 6,3; Hos 4,1).

Relevant in this context is Deut 18,20-22:

But the prophet who presumes to speak a word in my name which I have not commanded him to speak, or who speaks in the name of other gods, that same prophet shall die. And if you say in your heart, ‘How may we know the word which the Lord has not spoken?’ — when a prophet speaks in the name of the Lord, if the word does not come to pass or come true, that is a word which the Lord has not spoken; the prophet has spoken it presumptuously, you need not be afraid of him.

This is particularly relevant because of the link between prophet and Name. All prophets speak in the name of the Lord, but the false prophet speaks words that he has not been commanded to speak, and his word does not come to pass. This is the case of with Bar Jesus. He claims to speak with the authority of the name of Jesus (as his very name indicates), but he does not speak what the Lord has commanded. He perverts it. It is Barnabas and Saul who speak rightly the teaching of the Lord, and that results in believing (13,12).

It is curious that the term *ψευδοπροφήτης* is used in the Septuagint almost exclusively in Jeremiah. There, the false prophets are those who seize Jeremiah for saying that Yahweh will abandon the Temple (Jer 33,7.8.11 [LXX]). In Jer 27,9 [LXX], the false prophets are linked with the *μαντευόμενοι καὶ οἱ ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι καὶ οἱ οἰωνισμάτοι καὶ οἱ φαρμακοί*, not unlike the way Bar Jesus is here linked with the

⁽¹⁸⁾ See J. LEVISON, “Did the Spirit Withdraw from Israel? An evaluation of the earliest Jewish data”, *NTS* 43 (1997) 35-57.

μῶγοι. And Hananiah is a typical false prophet (Jer 35,1 [LXX]) because he stood in the Temple, but proclaimed falsely the intention of Yahweh. Bar Jesus has been proclaiming the word and will of God in Paphos, but from Luke's perspective, he has interpreted the ways of God falsely. That is the point of this whole episode. The authoritative prophetic word of God comes to Cyprus, according to Luke, only through Paul and Barnabas, the true prophets (13,1). Only they have been validly commissioned by the holy spirit to announce the word of God (13,2-3). And so the 'teaching of the Lord' (13,12) is seen in its full power and authority only when it comes through prophets and teachers validated by the holy spirit (13,9). Without that validation, one is a son of the opponent, the slanderer (διάβολος, 13,10), not a son of Jesus, despite the man's name.

Secondly, while early Christian writers used the term 'false prophet' of those outside the Christian pale (presumably in Rev 16,13; 19,20; and 20,10, for example), they also used it quite clearly to refer to someone within the broad Christian tradition. Christian communities were warned to be on their guard against false prophets who come in sheep's clothing (Matt 7,15; compare also 24,11; 24,24). Both 2 Pet 2,1 and 1 John 4,1 imply that the false teachers and prophets come from within the community. Paul does not refer specifically to false prophets, but he is well aware of false apostles (ψευδαπόστολοι, 2 Cor 11,13) and false brethren (ψευδοδῆλφοι, 2 Cor 11,26; Gal 2,4), again, obviously internal to the communities concerned. The same is also true of the prophets in Rev 2,2, and of the false teachers of the Pastorals (e.g. 2 Tim 3,6-8). And when the term 'false prophet' is used in the Didache, it distinctly refers to those within the Christian communities (11,5-10; 16,3). The only other time Luke himself uses the word 'false prophet' is in his Gospel (6,26) where he refers to those prophets who are clearly 'insiders' to Israel, not outsiders.

In Acts 13,8, the false prophet is said to have withstood (ἀνθίστατο) Barnabas and Saul. It is precisely that verb that is used in 2 Tim 3,8 to describe the opposition of Jannes and Jambres to Moses, and that of the false teachers to the truth of the Pauline tradition. Those men are described as 'men of corrupt mind and counterfeit faith', a description not dissimilar to that given by the Lukan Paul of Bar Jesus (13,10). The same verb is used again in 2 Tim 4,15, where Alexander is said to have 'strongly opposed our message' (λίαν ἀντέστη τοῖς ἡμετέροις λόγοις), and, as with other false teachers, 'the Lord will requite him for his deeds'. In other words, the verb ἀνθίστημι is used

almost technically for those who oppose someone's teaching or prophecy (see also Gal 2,11; Acts 6,10). In addition, the strong judgment that Luke, through the mouth of Paul, passes on Bar Jesus parallels closely similar judgments made throughout the New Testament on false teachers, false prophets, false brethren and the like (Matt 7,15; 2 Cor 11,13; Gal 1,9; 2 Thess 2,11; 2 Pet 2,1; Rev 19,20). In all cases, if these opponents are not actually within the communities, they are very close to them, and that is what makes them dangerous. And in this episode in Acts 13, Luke appears to be using terminology commonly used in Christian circles when writing about conflicts between false and true teachers or prophets⁽¹⁹⁾.

It is reasonable to conclude that Bar Jesus was a Jewish prophet, and one seen to be a serious threat to the Christian community, and therefore one in some contact with that community. He was a serious threat because he represented the word of God falsely and opposed the understanding of it by others coming from outside and also claiming to be prophets, namely, Saul and Barnabas (13,7-8). This episode, then, tells of a battle between prophets, in much the same way as 'orthodox' prophets of Israel stood in opposition to those 'false' prophets who also claimed authority to teach and reveal the ways of God. Klauck is close to the mark when he says that Luke tells this story to warn against an 'all-devouring syncretism that at its worst even usurps Christian substance such as the name of Jesus, and hence threatens the Church from within'⁽²⁰⁾. Klauck at least implies that Bar Jesus represented an internal threat. I doubt, however, that syncretism is the real problem for Luke; it is rather that this man interprets the way of the Lord wrongly, and so his authority is questionable. Valid authority only comes from those who have been given it by Jesus through the legitimate apostles, teachers, and prophets who through prayer and fasting and the laying on of hands, have been set apart by the Holy Spirit for such work (13,1-3). The acceptable prophets and teachers at Antioch are named by Luke (13,1); their teaching and prophecy are authoritative in Lukan circles.

Further support for this understanding of Bar Jesus comes from the charge brought against him by Paul that the prophet was 'making

⁽¹⁹⁾ Clearly, Bar Jesus is both a prophet and a teacher. The link is commonly made; indeed, Luke has made it in 13,1 (Compare also 1 Cor 12,28; *Did* 13,2; 15,1-1).

⁽²⁰⁾ H.-J KLAUCK, *Magic and Paganism in Early Christianity*. The World of the Acts of the Apostles (Translated by Brian McNeil) (Edinburgh 2000) 54.

crooked the straight paths of the Lord', and so was 'an enemy of all righteousness' (13,10). These two expressions are virtually synonymous. The straight paths of the Lord lead to righteousness (compare Ps 23,3); crooked paths, conversely, pervert righteousness. It is very common for scholars to think that Paul refers in this charge to Bar Jesus' magical practices and his financial profit from such practices. So, on these charges, Barrett says, "Luke has no love for those who have illicit, and probably profitable, dealings with the supernatural. The magus is roundly cursed"⁽²¹⁾. But I suggest his opposition to the faith (13,8) was more sophisticated and potentially more dangerous than that. Bar Jesus claims to be teaching the straight paths of the Lord, but Luke thinks he has made them crooked by his false understanding of righteousness. The strong language used by Paul, filled with biblical terms⁽²²⁾, suggests this man is a real threat, and that is possibly because he is was having influence inside the fold. By calling Bar Jesus a 'son of the devil' (υἱὸς διαβόλου), Luke has Paul expose the prophet for what he really is. He is the adversary (διάβολος) who 'comes and takes away the word from their hearts, that they might not believe and be saved' (Luke 8,12).

The links between false claimants, Satan, deceit, and unrighteousness, interestingly enough, are also found in Paul's writings. In 2 Cor 11,13-15, he writes,

For such men are false apostles, deceitful workmen, disguising themselves as apostles of Christ. And no wonder, for even Satan disguises himself as an angel of light. So it is not strange if his servants also disguise themselves as servants of righteousness. Their end will correspond to their deeds.

And similar links are found in 2 Thess 2,11-12,

Therefore God sends upon them a strong delusion, to make them believe what is false, so that all may be condemned who did not believe the truth but had pleasure in unrighteousness.

Bar Jesus in Acts fits the same bill. He is not a 'son of Jesus', as he is named, but rather is on the side of the opposition. But the adversary comes to those within like a wolf in sheep's clothing.. That is why Luke calls him 'false' and a *magos*. Even the non-Septuagintal term,

⁽²¹⁾ BARRETT, *Acts*, I, 617.

⁽²²⁾ For the Septuagintal language used here, see JERVELL, *Apostelgeschichte*, 347.

ῥαδιουργία, used by Luke in Acts 13,10, refers to deceit and chicanery, and unscrupulous fraud⁽²³⁾, and is indicative of an insider rather than of an outsider. It is his teaching about the way of the Lord that is delusional, not his magical powers or pagan syncretism.

Some of the Septuagintal terms used in this condemnation of Bar Jesus are worth further comment. To pervert (διαστρέφειν) the right ways is a feature of false prophets and of false behavior in general (compare Mic 3,9; Ezek 13,18; Prov 10,9; *Ps. Sol.* 10,3; Philo, *Sob.* 10), and this is what Bar Jesus is charged with doing. Scholars often point to Hos 14,9 (LXX 14,10) and see it as paralleling Paul's charge⁽²⁴⁾. Barrett also notes the parallel but thinks "it is unlikely that the passage is specifically referred to, since Hosea says that the transgressors shall stumble ... in them (sc. the paths), not that they will pervert them"⁽²⁵⁾. But that is an unnecessary distinction. From Luke's perspective, Bar Jesus perverts the straight paths of Yahweh; he does not walk in Yahweh's straight paths. This causes him to stumble and so to grope for someone to lead him by the hand (13,11).

The Hosea 14 passage is worth citing in full,

Whoever is wise, let him understand these things; whoever is discerning (συνετός), let him know them; for the ways of the Lord are right (εὐθεΐαι αἱ ὁδοὶ τοῦ κυρίου), and the upright (δίκαιοι) walk in them, but transgressors stumble in them.

According to Hosea, the righteous (δίκαιοι) walk the straight paths. Bar Jesus, however, is an 'enemy of all righteousness' (ἐχθρὸς πάσης δικαιοσύνης) because he has made those straight paths crooked (διαστρέφων τὰς ὁδοὺς τοῦ κυρίου τὰς εὐθείας). He belongs to the sinners and so stumbles. On the other hand, Luke says that the proconsul Sergius was συνετός, precisely the adjective used by Hosea of the wise man who follows the straight paths of the Lord. Sergius Paulus recognised the straight path of the word of God brought by Paul and Barnabas, and believed (13,12)⁽²⁶⁾. One might also note the

⁽²³⁾ See *BDAG*, 902.

⁽²⁴⁾ For example, G. SCHNEIDER, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Freiburg et al 1982) 123, n. 48.

⁽²⁵⁾ BARRETT, *Acts*, I, 617.

⁽²⁶⁾ It is possible to read Sergius Paulus as similar to Cornelius, that is, as a god-fearer who already belonged to the faith (compare 13,8). In any case, Luke seems to be following the usual pattern: Paul goes first to the synagogues (13,5), he meets opposition from Jews, but some god-fearers believe. Jervell thinks the proconsul belongs to the god fearers (*Apostelgeschichte*, 346).

connection between being συνετός and believing made in Sir 33,3: 'A man of understanding will trust in the law' (ἄνθρωπος συνετός ἐμπιστεύσει νόμῳ). If Luke is implicitly referring to this passage, then the suggestion again is that the νόμος and its interpretation is at stake in this conflict with Bar Jesus.

Jervell is right to claim that the use of Septuagintal terms suggests that Paul's charge "sind Worte gegen einen Juden" ⁽²⁷⁾. After all, Bar Jesus has already been identified as a Jew (13,6). But more importantly, it suggests that the conflict between Bar Jesus and Paul has been on scriptural matters, not on such things as magic or dream interpretation. If the word or law of God, and its interpretation, has been the centre of the debate, as 13,7 suggests, then again it makes sense to understand Bar Jesus as being familiar with that word and as having a particular teaching based on that word. In other words, Bar Jesus belongs close to the tradition, at the very least of the synagogue, if not actually within a Christian community at Paphos. In addition, the fact that it is the teaching of the Lord (διδάχῃ τοῦ κυρίου, 13,12) that astonishes the proconsul and leads to his believing is further evidence that this whole episode is not about magic versus Christianity, but about one teaching (namely, that of Paul) being truly derived from the Lord and based on the word of God versus another teaching (that of Bar Jesus) that has its authentication, as Luke would have it, from elsewhere.

4. *Bar Jesus*

One reason for thinking that this Jewish prophet was actually within the Christian community is found in his name. It is possible, of course, that Bar Jesus was the man's real name and that he was biologically the son of a man named Jesus. After all, it was common practice for prophets to be identified as the 'son of'. So, for example, Jehu is 'the son of Hanani' (1 Kgs 15,33), Elisha is 'the son of Shaphat' (1 Kgs 19,19), Isaiah is the 'son of Amoz' (2 Kgs 19,2) and Zechariah, the 'son of Iddo' (Ezra 6,14). So in order to bolster his claim as a prophet, this man used the self-designation, 'son of Jesus'. That is possible, but given the context and the significance of the name 'Jesus' in Acts, this seems too much of a coincidence. I suggest that we consider the possibility that the man called himself Bar Jesus because he thought himself to be a disciple of Jesus. Or, at the very least, he

⁽²⁷⁾ JERVELL, *Apostelgeschichte*, 347.

was like the ‘sons of’ Scaeva (a term which also might refer to Scaeva’s students or apprentices rather than to his biological sons) who exorcised in the name of Jesus even though, in Luke’s judgment, they did not belong to him (19,13-15). In other words, Bar Jesus claimed to be a follower of Jesus and to operate in his name and with his authority, but from Luke’s perspective, he has perverted the truth. Just as the sons of Scaeva had no authority to exorcise in the name of Jesus (19,13-16), so also this man has no authority to call himself a son of Jesus.

That the very name Bar Jesus could mean ‘a disciple of Jesus’ is not a new suggestion. According to Schmiedel, W.C. van Manen suggested it over one hundred years ago⁽²⁸⁾. However, it seems that van Manen argued on the assumption that the name Bar Jesus first appeared in a primary document available to Luke that did not include the qualifiers, ‘Jew’, ‘false prophet’ and ‘*magos*’. That speculation certainly weakened, rather than strengthened, his argument, and, I suggest, such an uncontrollable theory was unnecessary. As I have already indicated, one could claim to be a ‘disciple of Jesus’ and also be a Jew and a prophet.

It is well known that the expression ‘son of’ does not always refer to one’s paternity. It is often used idiomatically in Hebrew, Aramaic, and in Greek to indicate that one belongs to a particular group, or that one has particular characteristics⁽²⁹⁾. The expressions ‘sons of God’ or ‘sons of Israel’ are obvious examples. Joseph, who was given the name Barnabas, which Luke interprets as ‘son of encouragement’ (Acts 4,36), is an example of the association of name and character, as also is the name Boanerges, ‘the sons of thunder’ (Mark 3,17). Bar Cochba, the name taken by the Jewish revolutionary of about 120CE, is an example of the name indicating what was expected or hoped. It is possible that Bar Jesus derived his name from an eponymous use of Jesus’ name. A group of singers might call themselves ‘sons of Korah’ or ‘sons of Asaph’ (Ps 42,1; 44,1; 2 Chr 35,15, for example), and priestly groups might call themselves ‘sons of Aaron’ or ‘sons of Zadok’ (Lev 1,5; 2 Chr 35,14; Ezek 40,46, for example). The Jewish Scriptures also occasionally refer to the ‘sons of the prophets’, meaning a group of

⁽²⁸⁾ P. SCHMIEDEL, “Barjesus”, *Encyclopaedia Biblica*. A dictionary of the Bible (London 1899) 478-483; here, 480.

⁽²⁹⁾ See, for example, F. BROWN – S. DRIVER – C. BRIGGS, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford 1962) 120-121; J.A. PAYNE SMITH, *Compendious Syriac Dictionary*. Founded upon the Thesaurus Syriacus of R. Payne Smith (Oxford 1903) 53.

prophets associated with Elijah or Elisha, probably as disciples (1 Kgs 20,35; 2 Kgs 2,3-15; 6,1; 9,1). Luke himself has used that expression earlier in Acts. In his sermon at Pentecost, Peter said, ‘you are sons of the prophets and of the covenant’, and that was said in the context of God raising up Jesus as the prophet promised by Moses (Acts 3,17-26). Did Bar Jesus claim to be one of the sons of The Prophet?

According to Matthew, Jesus warned the Christian community against calling anyone ‘father’ (23,9) in a context where clearly the title refers to a teacher or leader of the community. If some Christians called their teacher ‘father’, it is logical that they should call themselves his ‘sons’. In Luke 11,19, Jesus refers to the disciples of the Pharisees as ‘your sons’ (οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν). Peter refers to Markos as ‘my son’ (ὁ υἱός μου, 1 Pet 5,13), and although that may be nothing more than a term of endearment, teachers did address their disciples as ‘sons’ (compare Heb 12,5; Prov 1,8; 2,1; 3,1). The *BDAG* also gives a number of examples from pagan literature in which the term ‘son’ is used of a follower or pupil, especially among various guilds⁽³⁰⁾. The Syriac church father, Ephraem, calls Bardesan’s followers, ‘the sons of Bardesan’⁽³¹⁾. This is evidence enough to suggest that the name Bar Jesus could indicate a teacher-disciple relationship. If that is a valid understanding, then it certainly implies that Bar Jesus claimed to belong inside the Jesus movement.

5. *Elymas and Bar Jesus*

But what does Luke mean when he refers to ‘Elymas the magician’ and then adds, ‘for so his name is interpreted’ (οὕτως γὰρ μεθερμηνεύεται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ)? Elymas is a name whose meaning has caused ‘endless bewilderment’⁽³²⁾. I suggest that Luke is playing both on the name Elymas and the name Bar Jesus. In addition, central to understanding his word-play is his repetition of the noun ὄνομα (13,6 and 8).

It is worth remembering that writers at the time delighted in finding meanings for names that today we dismiss as far-fetched, if not downright impossible. Three brief examples will illustrate. Philo thought that the Essenes “derive their name from their piety”,

⁽³⁰⁾ *BDAG*, 1024.

⁽³¹⁾ See K. BROCKELMANN, *Lexicon Syriacum* (Hildesheim 1966) 89.

⁽³²⁾ DUNN, *Acts*, 176. Fitzmyer categorically says, ‘No one knows what it means’ (*Acts*, 502).

believing their name was a variation of ὁσιότης (*Quod Omnis* 75). Luke himself says that Barnabas means ‘son of consolation’ (4,36), a derivation to which very few modern scholars would give their assent. For a curious logic, Clement of Alexandria is classic. He claims that when the bacchanals shriek ‘evoe’ (εὐοῖ) they are calling out the name Eva “by whom error came into the world. The symbol of the Bacchic orgies is a consecrated serpent. Moreover, according to the strict interpretation of the Hebrew term, the name Hevia, aspirated, signifies a female serpent” (*Exhortation to the Heathen* 2). I suggest that a key to understanding this baffling link between Elymas and Bar Jesus and the word *magos* is Luke’s use of this kind of etymological argument.

In 13,8, the choice is between understanding μάγος as a translation of Elymas, and understanding Elymas as a translation of the name (ὄνομα) mentioned in 13,6, namely Bar Jesus. As suggested, the use of the word ὄνομα in both 13,6 and 13,8 might not be at all coincidental. The issue of the sacred Name lurks. After all, the man is called Bar Jesus. Without exception, every time in Acts that Luke introduces a new character into the narrative, he does so by using the dative case, ὄνοματι (5,1.34; 8,9; 9,10.11.33.36; 10,1; 11,28; 12,13; 16,1.14; 17,34; 18,2.7.24; 19,24; 20,9; 21,10; 27,1). Only with Bar Jesus is the nominative case used; elsewhere, Luke uses the nominative ὄνομα exclusively of Jesus. By using the nominative in this episode to describe Bar Jesus, Luke draws sharp attention to the significance of the man’s name, of the Name, and of the relation between the two.

Among recent scholars, it is almost unanimously thought that μάγος in 13,8 is a translation of Elymas. It is suggested that the name Elymas derived either from the Aramaic word hlm or the Arabic alim, both meaning a ‘diviner’ or ‘dream-interpreter’. So Jervell says, “ὁ μάγος wird als Übersetzung des Namens Elymas bezeichnet ... Elymas ist wahrscheinlich die gräzisierte Form des aramäischen: haloma, ‘der Magier’”⁽³³⁾. Schille likewise says, “Lukas hat ... zu entlasten versucht, daß er μάγος als Übersetzung für Elymas versteht ... Tatsächlich kommt aramäisch אֱלִימָא = stark bzw. Arabisch alim = gelehrt der Bedeutung ‘Traumdeuter’ nahe”⁽³⁴⁾. This too is an old suggestion. The seventeenth century scholars, Edmund Castell and

⁽³³⁾ JERVELL, *Apostelgeschichte*, 346 and 346, n. 424.

⁽³⁴⁾ SCHILLE, *Apostelgeschichte*, 287; compare also SCHNEIDER, *Apostelgeschichte*, 122; L. YAURE, “Elymas-Nehelemite-Pethor”, *JBL* 79 (1960) 297-314; C. HEMER, *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History* (Tübingen 1989) 227; KLAUCK, *Magic*, 50.

John Lightfoot, had already suggested the Arabic derivation⁽³⁵⁾ and it was certainly still supported by some at the beginning of the twentieth century⁽³⁶⁾.

This explanation is held largely because the translation, Bar Jesus = Elymas, is believed to be impossible. Bruce states categorically: "Elymas ... is probably a Semitic word with a similar meaning to *magos*; it cannot be an interpretation of 'Barjesus'"⁽³⁷⁾. Likewise, Dunn says that Bar Jesus and Elymas have nothing to do with each other. He suggests that maybe Elymas was a nickname, "but if so, its point is too obscure for us"⁽³⁸⁾. Barrett also thinks it is impossible to translate Bar Jesus as Elymas, because the latter seems not to be a Greek name. He suggests we agree with Bengel who said: "*nescio quomodo, synonyma sunt*", but he himself then adds,

Failing this, the simplest and probably correct solution is that both names were, in the tradition (or traditions) that Luke used, applied to the man in question, and that Luke assumed that the form that appeared to be Greek must be a translation of the Semitic; cf. 4.36. The assumption is a natural one, though Luke might have reflected that the Latin *Paul* is not a translation of the Semitic *Saul* (v. 9)⁽³⁹⁾.

In another attempt to solve this puzzle, some have seized on the alternative reading *Ετοιμας* that appears in D and similarly in some Old Latin manuscripts. While Kirsopp Lake favoured this solution, he was well aware of its weakness: "This seems the best suggestion yet made, but the combination of a doubtful reading with a somewhat strained etymology is not quite convincing"⁽⁴⁰⁾. More recent scholarship has seen a number of problems with the hypothesis and so has abandoned it⁽⁴¹⁾.

There are other variant readings on the name of this man among which are βαριησοῦ, βαριησοῦς, βαριησοῦν, βαριησοῦαν. As Barrett suggests, βαριησοῦ and βαριησοῦαν may be regarded as alternative transliterations of ברִישׁוּעַ and βαριησοῦς and βαριησοῦν may be taken as attempts to improve the grammar⁽⁴²⁾. All of these suggest the man's name means 'son of Jesus/Jeshua'. However, some other variants read,

⁽³⁵⁾ SCHMIEDEL, "Barjesus", 480.

⁽³⁶⁾ See K. LAKE, *The Acts of the Apostles* (London 1933) IV, 144.

⁽³⁷⁾ BRUCE, *Acts*, 249.

⁽³⁸⁾ DUNN, *Acts*, 176.

⁽³⁹⁾ BARRETT, *Acts*, I, 615.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ LAKE, *Acts*, IV, 144.

⁽⁴¹⁾ See BARRETT, *Acts*, I, 615; and HAENCHEN, *Acts*, 398, n. 2.

⁽⁴²⁾ BARRETT, *Acts*, I, 613.

‘son of the Name’. The Syriac Peshitta, for example, reads bar šūmā (in some Greek manuscripts, transliterated, βαρσουμα) and some other Greek manuscripts read βαριησοῦμ. Professor S. Brock (Oxford) says that Baršūmā is not a normal Syriac name, and that -šūmā implies a Palestinian Aramaic pronunciation⁽⁴³⁾. In any case, these variants indicate that the man is called ‘son of the Name’. It is not difficult to see how ‘son of Jesus’ might be altered to ‘son of the Name’. After all, in Acts, Jesus is the Name given for salvation (4,12); it is the name of the heavenly being who speaks to Paul near Damascus (9,5); and it the name into which people are baptised (2,38) and upon whom believers call (2,14). So there is a close relation between Jesus and the Name, so close that it is not unexpected that some might out of devotion to Jesus, in fact call him The Name. As Barrett notes, ‘in rabbinic use 𐤒𐤔 (name) may stand for God; a Syriac translator who could not bring himself to say bar yesu might make the corresponding substitution’⁽⁴⁴⁾. Haenchen claims, “Now anybody with the faintest knowledge of Aramaic knew that Bar-Jesus meant ‘son of Jesus’, and Luke carefully refrains from alerting other readers also to the fact that this rascal bore the sacred name of Jesus as part of his own”⁽⁴⁵⁾. I suggest that Luke is doing precisely the opposite. He wants to show that not only is Bar Jesus a false prophet, but that his very name illustrates his falseness. He is not a son of Jesus. Luke draws attention to the name factor by repeating, in v 8, the noun ὄνομα that he had already used in v 6. The Syriac translations appear to have picked up on this repetition by repeating the name Baršūmā, used in v 6, in v 8. In addition, by translating the name, Luke is drawing further attention to it. The point for now is that there is a conceptual link between Jesus and The Name, a link made by Luke himself in Acts (4,12). So if one is a son of Jesus, one is also a son of the Name. But, Luke wants to show, the etymology of this man’s name is to be found not in Jesus the Name but elsewhere.

To explain this other etymology, Luke constructs word-play links between Bar Jesus and Elymas. The latter appears not to be a Greek name; however, it might be a contracted form of a longer name⁽⁴⁶⁾. Indeed, according to Schmiedel, G. Dalman thought that it is a contracted form of Ἐλυμοῖος and that the name has something to do

⁽⁴³⁾ In personal email communication, 14.10.02.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ BARRETT, *Acts*, I, 613.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ HAENCHEN, *Acts*, 402.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ See F. BLASS – A. DEBRUNNER – R. FUNK, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago – London 1961) §125.

with the Elamites (associated in Acts 2,9 with the Parthians and Medes). Schmiedel responded to this suggestion by saying, “Philologically this derivation is the simplest of all; but it contributes nothing towards the solution of the riddle”⁽⁴⁷⁾. But I propose that Dalman’s philological suggestion does, indeed, provide a clue, if not the solution.

The key is found with Josephus, probably a contemporary of Luke. According to him, Elymos (Ἐλυμος) was the son of Shem, and the ancestor of the Persians. He writes, “For Elymos left behind him the Elamites, the ancestors of the Persians” (Ἐλυμος μὲν γὰρ Ἑλυμαίων, Περσῶν ὄντας ἀρχηγέτας κατέλιπεν, *Ant* 1.6.4). As noted earlier, the *magoi* were commonly associated with the Persians. This is significant because with this datum we now have a link between Ἐλυμας and μάγος without going via the Aramaic or Arabic route.

Josephus’ information also helps in understanding how Luke can say that Bar Jesus is translated or interpreted as Elymas. Elymas is the son of Shem (cf Gen 10,22; 10,31; 1 Chr 1,17). The Hebrew name Shem (שׁם) and the Hebrew word for the Name (שׁם) provide an ideal opportunity for Luke to play on them. Both names, Elymas and Bar Jesus, can be interpreted to mean ‘the son of שׁם’. By playing on the name of the father of Elymos (Shem) and the sacred Name (Heb שׁם), Luke understands Elymas to be an interpretation of (μεθερμηνεύεται) Bar Jesus. By this word-play, Luke is in effect wanting to say that the meaning of Bar Jesus is not ‘son of Jesus’ [= the Name], but ‘son of Shem’, the ancestor of the *magoi*. The son of Shem and the ancestor of the *magoi* = Persians is Elymos. So, logically it seems to me, Luke can say that the name Elymas is an interpretation of the name Bar Jesus. It might be argued that Luke’s Greek-speaking audience would not catch Hebrew word-plays. But there is only one Hebrew word that I am suggesting Luke is playing with, and that is the word שׁם (Name). It is indeed feasible to assume that Greek-speakers would know that one Hebrew word, if they knew no other.

The point is that this man does not belong to the true followers of Jesus nor is he a member of the valid, authentic prophetic circle. Paul and Barnabas are the true exponents of the will and word of God, especially in the matter of righteousness. Bar Jesus, therefore, is not the son of the Name, but the son of Shem, the ancestor of the Persians and of the *magoi*, and so he is a *magos*, a foreigner to the true Christian community and an opponent of the truth.

(47) SCHMIEDEL, “Barjesus”, 480.

Finally, I draw attention to the fact that Luke was aware of other false claimants in the communities he knew. In Acts 19,13-16, he exposes the sons of Scaeva who use the Name to exorcise. In his Gospel, he repeats Mark's report that there was a man casting out demons 'in the name of Jesus', but he was forbidden by the disciples because he was not 'following with us' (Luke 9,49-50//Mark 9,38-40). In addition, even Apollos, already a Christian, needed to have the way of God expounded to him more accurately (18,26). Bar Jesus belonged to a category somewhere between Apollos and the sons of Scaeva. He had the name, 'son of Jesus', but he did not follow the correct understanding of the way of God as taught by Paul and Barnabas.

*
* * *

In summary, I have proposed an alternative understanding of Bar Jesus to that given in scholarship. I have argued that Luke represents Bar Jesus in Acts 13 as a serious opponent of the Christian faith, not because he taught or practiced heathen magic, nor because he practiced some kind of syncretism, but because he taught the righteous ways of God in a false way. Bar Jesus claimed to be a prophet, he claimed to live up to his name as a 'son of Jesus' who correctly understood the way of the Lord, but the Lukan Paul exposed him as a false exponent of that way. Testing the spirit, and distinguishing true prophecy from false were difficult issues in many early Christian communities. But Luke was not afraid to make that judgment. For him, it was Paul, a man filled with a holy spirit who had authority in the teaching of the Lord, and his true exposition of the righteous ways of God convinced the intelligent proconsul who then believed.

Studies in Religion
University of Queensland
Brisbane, Australia 4072

Rick STRELAN

SUMMARY

In Acts 13, Bar Jesus is confronted by Paul and cursed by him. This false prophet is generally thought to have been syncretistic and virtually pagan in his magical practices. This article argues that he was in fact very much within the synagogue and that he had been teaching the ways of the Lord. He was also a threat to the Christian community of Paphos and may even have belonged inside of it. Luke regards him as a serious threat to the faith because of his false teaching about righteousness and the ways of the Lord.

ANIMADVERSIONES

The Choice to Serve God and Assist His People: Rahab and Yael

The stories of Yael (Judg 4,17-22) and Rahab (Josh 2) share the common theme of a gentile woman assisting an Israelite man⁽¹⁾. Rahab saves two Israelite spies from the King of Jericho (Josh 2), and Yael kills Sisera while he attempts to escape from Barak (Judg 4,17-22). These two stories are connected in a web of analogies⁽²⁾. I will first present this structural network, and then disclose its meaning; finally, I will discuss the meaning of each story in light of the differences between the analogous stories.

1. Analogy between Rahab and Yael

(1) In both cases a gentile woman unexpectedly assists Israel⁽³⁾. Rahab is a harlot and a citizen of Jericho. Her clear and overt statement of belief in God is surprising (Josh 2,9-11), as is the courageous assistance — endangering her own life — which she provides to the Israelite spies (Josh 2,4.15-16). Yael belongs to the clan of the Kenites, who maintain good relations with Israel and with Canaan (Judg 4,11.17). Nevertheless, her intervention in favor of Israel is surprising and her elimination of Sisera, the Canaanite general of Canaan, is a noteworthy act.

(2) The spies find shelter in Rahab's house, while Sisera seeks shelter in Yael's tent. Rahab hides the men so they will not be caught by the king's soldiers (Josh 2,4.6), and Yael covers Sisera with a blanket and appears to hide him from Barak (Judg 4,18.19). At this point the stories part ways: Rahab hides the spies and saves them; Yael hides Sisera but kills him and saves Israel.

(3) In the two stories a man relies on a woman who pretends to offer help; both women use trickery. Rahab tells the King's soldiers that the spies have already left and encourages the soldiers to chase after them (Josh 2,5). The soldiers believe her, but the spies are actually hiding in the house (Josh

(1) Zakovitch thinks these stories belong to a narrative type which he calls "A Woman Who Rescues a Man". See Y. ZAKOVITCH, "Humor and Theology or the Successful Failure of Israelite Intelligence: A Literary-Folkloric Approach to Joshua 2", *Text and Tradition. The Hebrew Bible and Folklore* (ed. S. NIDRICH) (Atlanta 1990) 79. But the stories treated here share a stronger connection as in both the women are foreign women who come to help Israel.

(2) Nelson has indicated the similarity of these stories but only briefly and generally. R.D. NELSON, *Joshua. A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville 1997) 43 and n. 9.

(3) Klein believes that Yael was an Israelite who married a Kenite, and acted in favor of her people's interests and not in the interests of her husband, L.R. KLEIN, *The Triumph of Irony in the Book of Judges* (Bible and Literature Series 14; Sheffield 1988) 43. However, there is no indication that Yael was not a Kenite. Others have disputed this opinion, see B.G. WEBB, *The Book of the Judges. An Integrated Reading* (JSOTSS 46; Sheffield 1987) 137; J.W.H. BOS, "Out of the Shadows: Genesis 38; Judges 4:17-22; Ruth 3", *Semeia* 42 (1988) 37.

2,7,22). Yael invites Sisera to her tent and shows him hospitality. He trusts her (Judg 4,20), while she intends to kill him.

(4) A pursuit lies in the background of both stories. In the Rahab episode, the King of Jericho pursues the spies; in the Yael story Barak chases Sisera. In both cases a woman determines the outcome of the pursuit.

(5) The two stories occur in the residence of the woman. Rahab gives shelter to the spies in her house and Sisera seeks shelter in Yael's tent. Rahab sends the soldiers away from her house, while Yael invites Sisera into her tent.

(6) In both stories sexual connotations play an important part in plot development. The fact that Rahab is a harlot is a dominant element in her story. As the spies enter the house of a harlot, the impression is that a sexual encounter will ensue. But contrary to this expectation, the verse ends with an assertion that the spies "lay [down] there" (וישכבו שמה) instead of the similar, but more sexual "lay with her" (וישכב איתה) ⁽⁴⁾. A second incidence of the verb "lay" intensifies these sexual connotations (v. 8) ⁽⁵⁾. The king arrives at Rahab's house and instructs her: "Bring out the men who came to you, who came to your house" (הוציאי האנשים הבאים אליך אשר באו לביתך) (v. 3). The duplication in the king's words (1. came to you, 2. came to your house) is meant to convey two possibilities that play on the term "to come", which connotes sexual activity אל לבוא. The first possibility is that the spies arrived at Rahab's house for a sexual encounter and the second is that they came to her house simply to lodge there ⁽⁶⁾. Rahab deceives the king and chooses the first possibility — "True, the men came to me" — implying that sexual intercourse has taken place between her and the spies. However, the narrator has already conveyed that the spies "lay [down] there" (v. 1) and not with Rahab. By means of this lie Rahab rejects any suspicion that she has cooperated with the spies, suggesting rather that they came, like most of her visitors, for sexual satisfaction, and, when their desires were met, they left. If she had not lied, but rather claimed that there had been no sexual intercourse, and that the spies had come to lodge at the inn, she could not have claimed that they had already left. The apparent sexual intentions of the spies constitute a good alibi for Rahab's claim that she did not know where they came from (v. 4).

In Yael's story, too, sexual connotations play an important role in the plot. Yael uses her sexuality, and sexually allusive language, to defeat Sisera. She greets him and invites him into her tent. The intention of the invitation, however, is ambiguous: "Turn in, my lord, *turn in to me*". Does she mean that he should enter her tent or does her invitation promise sexual relations? The sexual implication in her words may be compared to the invitation which Lot extended to the angels; Lot's offer is formulated in similar words, yet without any ambiguity: "*my lords, turn in, I pray you, into your servant's house*" (Gen

⁽⁴⁾ See e.g.: Gen 34,2; 35,22; Lev 19,20; 2 Sam 13,14.

⁽⁵⁾ For different suggestions about this duplication, see: W.L. MORAN, "The Repose of Rahab's Israelite Guests", *Studi sull'Oriente e la Bibbia offerti al P. Giovanni Rinaldi nel 60 compleanno da allievi, colleghi, amici* (ed. H. CAZELLES) (Genova 1967) 273-284, esp. 275-278.

⁽⁶⁾ For this interpretation, see: R Isaac ABRAVANEL, *Commentary on Joshua* (Hamburg 1787) chap 2, v. 3; P.A. BIRD, "The Harlot as Heroine: Narrative Art and Social Presupposition in Three Old Testament Texts", *Semeia* 46 (1989) 128-129. ZAKOVITCH, "Humor and Theology", 82-83, 84.

19,2). While Lot's words are clear: "turn...into...house" (סורו אל בית עבדכם) Yael uses the same verb but applies it to herself: "turn into me" (סורו אלי). This form resembles another sexual formula ויבא אל. Yael's greeting and invitation allude to the terminology and descriptions of a prostitute in the Book of Proverbs (9,15-16) (7). The sibilance of the invitation in the original Hebrew may be meant as well to underscore the sensuality contained in Yael's voice (8). The repetition of the fact that Yael covers Sisera is also part of a sexual setting (vv. 18, 19). And certainly the fact that the whole scene takes place in Yael's bed creates a sexual atmosphere (9). It is reasonable to assume that the attraction that Yael dissembles for Sisera is the cause for his confidence in her; he even trusts her with his life. Sexuality is also prominent in the encounter between Yael and Barak. First, she goes out to greet Barak "Yael came out to meet him". Then she invites him into the tent to see Sisera's condition, but when the narrator describes his entrance to the tent he chooses the term "he came into her" (ויבא אליה) that may also indicate sexual intercourse, midrashically expounded.

(7) In both stories the behaviours of the men is presented ironically compared with that of the women. The king and his soldiers seem pathetic when they immediately believe the harlot that her customers are not in the house. The type of hospitality Yael offers Sisera reflects his childlike helplessness: she gives him a drink and covers him with a blanket. It is ironic that a woman kills an experienced warrior who has survived the battlefield (10). The assistance that Rahab provides the spies also presents them in an ironic light. The spies are passive in comparison with Rahab who actively hides them, allowing them to escape from the city: "But the woman took the two men and hid them" (Josh 2,4); "She brought them up to the roof and hid them" (Josh 2,6). "Then she let them down by a rope through the window" (Josh 2,15). She also gives them good advice about where to escape (Josh 2,16), and she is the dominant party in the dialogue with the spies. Barak is presented in an unflattering manner when she invites him into her tent to see that the man that he has been pursuing has already been put to death (Judg 4,22). Both Yael and Rahab are in control of the men they want to subdue and the men whom they plan to help. It is in their power to decide who will triumph and who will fail. The encounters of Yael and Rahab with men are presented in a similar

(7) An extensive description of a woman's seductions is found in Prov 7,5-23.

(8) About alliteration in biblical narrative see: L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL, *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics* (Subsidia Biblica 11; Rome 1988) 20-29. The Babylonian Talmud Megillah 15a realizes the inviting tone of Yael's words: "Rahab inspired lust by her name; Yael by her voice, Abigail by her memory; Michal daughter of Saul by her appearance".

(9) Reference to sexual intercourse is apparent in the poetic account in Judg 5, 27. This remark was midrashically expounded by R. Johanan in the Babylonian Talmud, Yebamoth 103a. On the sexual allusions see also: Y. ZAKOVITCH, "Sisseras Tod", ZAW 93 (1981) 364-374. S. NIDITCH, "Eroticism and Death in the Tale of Jael", *Gender and Difference in Ancient Israel* (ed. P.L. DAY) (Minneapolis 1989) 43-57. R. ALTER, *The Art of Biblical Poetry* (New York 1985) 48-49. Sexual allusions are explicit in the pseudepigraphic book Pseudo-Philo 31:3: "Jael the wife of Heber the Kenite adorned herself and went out to meet him; now the woman was very beautiful... And Sisera went in, and when he saw roses scattered on the bed, he said, 'if I am saved, I will go to my mother, and Yael will be my wife'".

(10) For the shame of a man killed by a woman see also Judg 9,53-54; 2 Sam 11,21.

fashion. In the Rahab story the soldiers are sent to her to find the spies and she disrupts their mission when she sends them out of the city:

And the king of Jericho sent unto Rahab,... and she said: pursue after them quickly; for ye shall overtake them (Josh 2, 3.5).

The spies have been sent by Joshua; they come to Rahab who sends them to hide in the mountains and assists them in their mission:

And Joshua...sent... two men to spy...and came into an harlot's house, named Rahab...And she said unto them, Get you to the mountain, lest the pursuers meet you (Josh 2,1.16) (11).

Similarly, Yael stands against Barak and Sisera and she decides whom to assist and whom to defeat, achieving both her goals. The women's encounters with these two men are described in a similar way (12).

Jael came out to meet Sisera, and said to him, 'Turn in, my lord, turn in to me; have no fear.' So he turned in to her into the tent (4,18). Jael came out to meet him, and said to him, 'Come, and I will show you the man whom you are seeking.' So he went into her [tent] (4,22).

Yael's dominant role is intensified especially since Sisera and Barak are rivals. And the organization of the two armies by their generals is described in a similar manner to the description of Yael's interaction with the men (13):

Barak summoned Zebulun and Naphtali to Kedesh; and he went up by foot with ten thousand men behind him (4,10).

Sisera summoned all his chariots, nine hundred chariots of iron, and all the troops who were with him (4,13).

The two descriptions use the same phrase "Sisera/Barak summoned" but they contrast Sisera's advantage "nine hundred chariots of iron" with Barak marching by foot. In the battle scene the two forces are compared:

"Barak went down from mount" (4,14). After Sisera's army was defeated it is said:

"Sisera went down from his chariot and fled away on foot" (4,15).

Barak goes down from Mount Tabor to his victory; Sisera goes down from his chariots, the symbol of his power, and flees on foot. Now the reader is under the impression that the battle is reaching an end. But at this point Yael appears on the scene and she overshadows both generals, Sisera and Barak.

(8) Finally, it might be added that both stories deal with wars of Israel and the Canaanites.

(11) See NELSON, *Joshua*, 40.

(12) D.F. MURRAY, "Narrative Structure and Technique in the Deborah-Barak Story, Judges iv 4-22", *Studies in the Historical Books of the Old Testament* (ed. J.A. EMERTON) (SVT 30; Leiden 1979) 172; R.H. O'CONNELL, *The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges* (SVT 63; Leiden 1996) 129.

(13) These parallels are discussed by L. Alonso Schökel ("Erzählkunst im Buche der Richter", *Bib* 42 (1961) 160-167) mainly on stylistic grounds. They are developed and viewed in the context of their narrative function by MURRAY, "Narrative Structure and Technique in the Deborah-Barak Story", 169-171. In the present discussion the emphasis is on the function of these parallels in the characterization of the figures in the narrative.

2. *The Meaning of the Analogy*

In both stories God leads his people to victory over their enemies. Rahab conveys this conception as part of her belief in God and her prediction about the events to come. In Judg 4, Deborah expresses this conviction as a prophecy before the battle:

Josh 2,9
And she said unto the men,
I know that the Lord has given you
the land.

Judg 4,14
And Deborah said unto Barak,
Up! for this is the day in which the Lord has
given Sisera into your hand.

The analogous structure of the two stories demonstrates the ways of God's salvation to his people. Usually women do not participate in war, but in these stories their actions are crucial in the implementation of the divine plan. The intervention of these two women is unexpected. The spies are discovered and their surrender to the king seems close, but Rahab does not help her king but rather, with outstanding skill and courage, she assists the spies. The king believes her and does not check the authenticity of her words. In Judg 4, Sisera flees from Barak and goes to Yael's tent believing that she will give him shelter. Yael brings him into her home, giving him the impression that he has come to a safe haven, and he goes so far as to trust her with his life. Surprisingly, Yael does not assist him but rather his Israelite pursuer. These unexpected interventions of women in favor of Israel are meant to demonstrate the concealed ways of the divine sovereignty. When God is about to save his people his ways are numerous, varied, and unexpected. The fact that these women are gentiles adds even more to the hidden ways of God's actions⁽¹⁴⁾.

The motif of surprise in the assistance that these women give to Israel stands in contrast to the failed expectations in the story of Delilah (Judg 16,4-22); there is an expectation that this gentile woman will assist her Israelite lover, but she does not. Out of all the women Samson falls for, Delilah is the only one whom he loves (Judg 16,4). The Philistines understand that their only way to overcome Samson is to take advantage of his weakness for women, and thus they bribe Delilah with a promise of money and a husband in order seduce Samson to reveal the secret of his strength. Delilah is tempted by the offer and she takes advantage of her relations with Samson in order to place him into the hands of the Philistines⁽¹⁵⁾. Her decision leads her in the opposite direction of Yael and Rahab. Like them, Delilah uses trickery to overcome Samson, and, as in the stories of Yael and Rahab, in the Samson story, too, sexuality plays a crucial part in the plot.

In addition to discussing the similarities of these stories, it is useful to examine their significant differences, shedding light on the uniqueness of

⁽¹⁴⁾ According to L. Hoppe, Israel depends on the protection of God who may use even inappropriate persons to effect the divine will (*Joshua, Judges with an Excursus on Charismatic Leadership in Israel* [Old Testament Messages 5; Wilmington 1982] 31).

⁽¹⁵⁾ Delilah is in a dilemma about whom to help — her people or her lover. This resembles the dilemma of Michal over whether to help her husband or her father. Michal makes a moral choice. Delilah, however, does not assist her lover and she does not help her people for moral reasons but out of greed.

each character and the particular meaning of each story. Rahab's motive in assisting Israel is clear in her words. She feels the danger of the approaching confrontation with Israel, as they invade Canaan; she decides to help the spies and hopes that they will return the favor and save her. Rahab is a harlot and not an accepted member of society, which may explain her willingness to leave her own people and join another group⁽¹⁶⁾. However, the narrative also emphasizes Rahab's deep belief in God⁽¹⁷⁾. In one of the most impressive statements in the Bible on faith, Rahab expresses the awe-inspiring quality of the monotheistic conception:

I know that the LORD has given you the land, ...As soon as we heard it, our hearts melted, and there was no courage left in any of us because of you. The LORD your God is indeed God in heaven above and on the earth below (Josh 2,9-11).

In these words Rahab expresses the notion that God is sovereign. The narrator shapes Rahab's words as a combination of two quotations from the Pentateuch, one from the Song of Moses at the sea of Reeds and the second from Deuteronomy.

Exod 15,15-16	Josh 2,9
<i>All the inhabitants of Canaan melted</i>	and that <i>dread of you has fallen on us,</i>
<i>Terror and dread fell upon them</i>	and that <i>all the inhabitants of the land melt in</i> <i>fear before you.</i>

In the Song of Moses, the feeling expressed is that the greatness of the miracle will affect the nations of Canaan and they, too, will recognize the power of God. The presentation of Rahab as a person capable of quoting the Song of Moses shows that the miracle has affected her according to the statement in the Song, and she, indeed, recognizes the power of God. This acknowledgement of Rahab is in contrast to the behavior of the King of Jericho and his soldiers who pursue the spies.

Rahab's words are structured in a Deuteronomistic style and they quote Deuteronomy 4,39:

Deut 4,39	Josh 2,9-11
<i>Know therefore this day,</i>	<i>I know that the LORD has given you the land...</i>
<i>And consider it in thine heart,</i>	<i>our hearts melted...</i>
<i>That the Lord he is God</i>	<i>The LORD your God is indeed God</i>
<i>In heaven above and on the earth below</i>	<i>in heaven above and on the earth below</i>

⁽¹⁶⁾ See, e.g., E.J. HAMLIN, *Inheriting The Land*. A Commentary on the Book of Joshua (Grand Rapids – Edinburgh 1983) 17.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Campbell believes that the main idea of the story of Rahab is the moral choice that Rahab makes to adopt the covenant with God, and that accordingly she and her family join the covenant nation. See K.M. CAMPBELL, "Rahab's Covenant: A Short Note on Joshua 2:9-21", VT 22 (1972) 243-244. Some believe that Rahab's decision is motivated merely by her understanding that she is in danger and this is the way to save herself and her family. See ZAKOVITCH, "Humor and Theology", 90.

The context of the source in Deuteronomy is a warning that if Israel does not follow God, he will exile them from the land. If, however, they follow God's commandments they will flourish in the land. The quotation of Rahab from this source is meant to show that she acknowledges the greatness of God and that she, too, is worthy of remaining in the land, contrary to other members of her people⁽¹⁸⁾.

By presenting Rahab's words as quotations from the Pentateuch the author attempts to present her as one who is familiar with Israel's beliefs and acquainted with their heritage; for this she deserves to belong with them and to be saved from the doom that befalls her Canaanite brethren.

But why does Yael choose to help Barak; what is her motive⁽¹⁹⁾? The reader searches the story in vain for an answer. Yael belongs to a people who have good relations with the Canaanites and with the Israelites, as evident in two verses in the story. "Now Heber the Kenite had separated from the other Kenites, that is, the descendants of Hobab the father-in-law of Moses" (v. 11). This verse is balanced by another: "Now Sisera had fled away on foot to the tent of Yael wife of Heber the Kenite; for there was peace between King Jabin of Hazor and the clan of Heber the Kenite" (v. 17). The relations between the Canaanites and the Kenites are on Sisera's mind when he chooses to find shelter. The Kenites are in good relations with the Canaanites as well as with the Israelites⁽²⁰⁾. The narration indicates the neutrality of the Kenites in order to obscure the motives of Yael, and to avoid any explanation in the political field⁽²¹⁾. On the contrary she acts in contradiction to the interests of the Kenite clan⁽²²⁾. The ways of divine providence in the Yael story are even more obscure than in the Rahab story; the concealment of Yael's motives leave an impression of wonder at such divine intervention.

The absence of Yael's motives in the story serves yet another purpose. Deborah is the judge in this story⁽²³⁾. The uniqueness of Deborah is that she does not take part in the war, as do the other judges in the book. She acts as a

⁽¹⁸⁾ For the Deuteronomistic style of Rahab's words, see M. NOTH, *Das Buch Josua* (HAT; Tübingen 1953) 9; J.A. SOGGIN, *Joshua. A Commentary* (OTL; London 1972) 41-42. For a different conclusion than mine, see NELSON, *Joshua*, 50.

⁽¹⁹⁾ This is probably the problem Klein (*The Triumph of Irony in the Book of Judges*, 43) aimed to solve when she determined that Yael is an Israelite. See n. 3 above.

⁽²⁰⁾ For relations between these three groups, see: F.C. FENSHAM, "Did a Treaty Between the Israelites and the Kenites Exist?", *BASOR* 175 (1964) 51-54. Contrary to Fensham there is no indication that Yael acted in accordance with the treaty between Israel and the Kenites; on the contrary the story asserts a stronger alliance between the Canaanites and the Kenites. Indeed, Sisera flees towards Yael's tent presumably with a belief that he will find a shelter there.

⁽²¹⁾ Y. AMIT, *The Book of Judges. The Art of Editing* (Biblical Interpretation Series 38; Leiden 1999) 211.

⁽²²⁾ Bos mentioned this point to demonstrate the independence of Yael and that she does not act in line of what is expected from women, see: BOS, "Out of the Shadows", 52-53. Similarly, also T.J. SCHNEIDER, *Judges* (Berit Olam, Collegeville 2000) 77. But these scholars who attempt to glorify Yael do not provide an understanding of her motives to assist the Israelites.

⁽²³⁾ This is the most common opinion, see e.g. MURRAY, "Narrative Structure and Technique in the Deborah-Barak Story", 167. Contrary to others who think that Barak is the Judge, see J.A. SOGGIN, *Judges. A Commentary* (OTL; London 1981) 71-72; WEBB, *Judges*, 137 and see also p. 133.

prophetess: she appoints Barak, instructs him where to organize his army, how many soldiers to summon, and where from. She also instructs him when to attack Sisera's army. She does all this as a prophetess who transmits God's instructions to Barak. When Barak refuses to accept the commission unless Deborah joins him, she delivers another prophecy, that a woman and not Barak will kill Sisera: "However, there will be no glory for you on the road on which you are going for the Lord will sell Sisera into the hand of a woman" (v. 9)⁽²⁴⁾. The uniqueness of the story of Deborah is that it only presents the prophetic personality of Deborah and totally disregards her private personality. The vivid and lucid message is that God and not man is the source of salvation.

The abstruseness of Yael's motives for killing Sisera enables the reader to focus on Deborah who has foreseen that "the Lord will sell Sisera into the hand of a woman" (v. 9)⁽²⁵⁾. Yael's role in the story is to materialize Deborah's prophecy. The analogy between Rahab and Yael moves the reader to appreciate the prophetic personality of Deborah, essential to the meaning of the story.

*
* *

In sum, this paper uncovers the web of analogies between Rahab and Yael, two gentile women who choose to assist Israel against its Canaanite enemy. The significance of the analogous structure is that divine providence works in surprising and unexpected ways, and that God often uses unanticipated and unexpected agents. God is sovereign over all, and all humans are instruments to implement his plan. Significant differences between Yael and Rahab enlighten the special meaning of each story. Rahab's motives in assisting Israel are her acknowledgement of the greatness of God. She seeks to save herself and her family from the destruction of the Canaanites and to join God's people. Yael's motives to assist Israel are obscure. The concealment of her motives is meant to detract attention from the attractive qualities of Yael and to focus on the prophetic personality of Deborah who had predicted Yael's actions.

Bar-Ilan University (RA)
Faculty of Jewish Studies
Department of Bible Studies
52900 Ramat-Gan, Israel

Elie ASSIS

⁽²⁴⁾ Some think that this sentence is not a prophecy and does not refer to Yael but is a logical conclusion from Barak's reluctance and dependence on Deborah. According to this interpretation Deborah is referring to herself. This interpretation was adopted by Qimhi, Joseph Qera. See Y. KAUFMAN, *The Book of Judges* (Jerusalem 1978) 124 (Hebrew). Above I have followed those who think that Deborah's words are a prophecy referring to Yael, see e.g. G.F. MOORE, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges* (ICC; Edinburgh 1895) 116-117; J.D. MARTIN, *The Book of Judges* (CBC; Cambridge 1975) 57.

⁽²⁵⁾ Contrary to Amit who claims that there is not one central hero in the story and that there is a balance in the presentation of the heroes meant to convey the message that the Lord is the only hero in the story. Y. AMIT, "Judges 4: Its Contents and Form", *JSOT* 39 (1987) 89-111.

SUMMARY

This paper presents a series of analogies between Rahab and Yael, both gentiles, who unexpectedly choose to assist Israel against the Canaanites. The analogies are designed to illustrate the surprising and unanticipated means through which divine providence operates. Noteworthy differences between the two heroines indicate the specific significance of each story. Rahab's conduct is motivated by her recognition of God's absolute power. Yael's motives, however, are unclear. Their concealment is meant to detract attention from Yael's appealing character and focus on the prophetic role played by Deborah who had predicted Yael's behaviour.

So May God Do To Me!

The Hebrew Bible contains an enigmatic phrase: כִּה יַעֲשֶׂה לִּי אֱלֹהִים וְכִה יוֹסִיף. These words can be translated as follows: “So may God do to me and more also.” The expression is found in the books of Samuel, Kings and Ruth, and is invariably followed by a solemn pledge⁽¹⁾. It is not clear to what exactly the expression refers, though it is evident that a severe punishment is implied⁽²⁾. The combination of the verb עָשָׂה “to do” and the preposition לִ “to” may also have the more positive meaning of “to do on behalf of”⁽³⁾. This expression, however, has no such positive meaning, but is rather an imprecation of oneself. The negative meaning becomes particularly evident from 1 Sam 3,17, where Eli the priest does not imprecate himself, but imprecates his junior assistant Samuel: כִּה יַעֲשֶׂה לְךָ אֱלֹהִים וְכִה יוֹסִיף אִם תַּכְחִיד מִמֶּנִּי דָבָר מִכָּל הַדְּבָר אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר אֵלַיךְ “So may God do to *you* and more also, if you hide anything from me of all that he told you”. Eli’s threat impresses Samuel so much that he tells his master everything instantly.

Below, I will address the origins and the usage of the Hebrew self-imprecatory formula. Also, I will endeavour to discover to what extent those who pronounced the formula appear to have been aware of the self-imprecatory nature of the phrase. And finally, I will try to shed some light on the degree to which its use met with disapproval in early Judaism and early Christianity.

1. A conditional self-imprecation

In many cases, the phrase כִּה יַעֲשֶׂה לִּי אֱלֹהִים וְכִה יוֹסִיף is immediately conditioned: “So may God do to me and more also, *if* ...” The condition always relates to future actions either by the speaker himself or for which the speaker will take responsibility at least partly. God may punish the speaker, if the latter fails his promise⁽⁴⁾. If, on the other hand, the promise is kept, the self-imprecation is revoked automatically⁽⁵⁾.

⁽¹⁾ The phrase occurs in 2 Sam 3,35; 19,14 (transl. 19,13); 1 Kgs 2,23; 2 Kgs 6,31. The phrase also occurs in 1 Sam 14,44; 20,13; 25,22; 2 Sam 3,9; 1 Kgs 19,2; 20,10; Ruth 1,17, though in somewhat altered forms.

⁽²⁾ The Good News Bible renders the phrase as follows: “May God strike me dead” or, in the case of Ruth 1,17, as: “May the Lord’s most severe punishment come upon me”.

⁽³⁾ See 1 Sam 14,6; Isa 5,4, etc.

⁽⁴⁾ For biblical self-imprecations in which the deity is not the subject of the curse, see Ps 7,4-6; 137,5-6; Job 31,7-10,19-22,38-40. In Ps 7 and Job 31, the self-imprecatory phrases are a way of stressing claims of innocence.

⁽⁵⁾ The conditional self-imprecation differs from the biblical “vow” (Hebrew: נִדָּר). In the conditional self-imprecation, only the self-imprecation is conditional, whilst the promise is unconditional. For the “vows”, the promise is conditional: “(Only) if ..., I shall ...”. For this distinction, see T.W. CARTLEDGE, *Vows in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East* (JSOTSS 147; Sheffield 1992) 11-18.

In a similar way, King David swears⁽⁶⁾ that he will abstain from food and drink all day because of the murder of general Abner: "So may God do to me and more also, if I taste bread or anything else before the sun goes down" (2 Sam 3,35). The focus is on the oath, which is underscored by self-imprecation. This is no different in 2 Sam 19,14, where David promises Amasa to appoint him commander-in-chief: "So may God do to me and more also, if you will not be the commander of the army before me all days instead of Joab", a promise that David will prove to keep.

In other cases, the self-imprecatory phrase occurs syntactically disconnected from the solemn pledge that follows. When Ruth promises never to abandon her mother-in-law Naomi while she is still alive, she says: "So may YHWH do to me and more also! Indeed, death will make separation between me and you" (Ruth 1,17)⁽⁷⁾. Similarly, Jonathan, Abner and Solomon pronounce the self-imprecatory phrase, which is followed up by a syntactically independent sentence (1 Sam 20,13; 2 Sam 3,9; 1 Kgs 2,23). It may be clear that in such cases the self-imprecation still functions as a reinforcement of the pledge. In all the instances mentioned so far, the speakers also fulfilled the promises they made.

2. An accompanying gesture

The repeated use of the word כה "so" in the self-imprecatory phrase has always raised questions. It has been suggested that the word originally referred to some gesture or symbolic act that made clear exactly what kind of punishment the speaker had in mind⁽⁸⁾. In 1 Sam 11,7, כה יעשה ל "so may be done to" refers to Saul's act of cutting a yoke of oxen in pieces in order to demonstrate what will happen to the oxen of those who are unwilling to join the army. Supportive of the view that כה refers to a symbolic act is the fact that the phrase *per se* is meaningless, even to the extent that it does not make clear whether what God may do to the speaker is a positive or a negative thing. What words fail to make clear, may have been compensated for by a non-verbal act. Å. Viberg discusses two symbolic acts that may accompany oath-taking: raising the hand and, secondly, putting the hand under someone

⁽⁶⁾ The direct speech is introduced by the phrase: וישבע דוד לאמר "And David swore, saying ...". In 1 Kgs 2,23, the verb שבע *nif.* is also used in the introduction to the direct speech beginning with the self-imprecation. For the close connection between oath and self-imprecation in the Hebrew Bible, see I. KOTTSEPER, "שבע", *TWAT* VII, 974-1000.

⁽⁷⁾ The usual phrase is: "So may God do to me and more also". Only in the self-imprecations in 1 Sam 20,13 and Ruth 1,17 is יהוה (YHWH) used instead of the usual אלהים (God). In 2 Sam 3,9 and 1 Kgs 2,23, with nearby occurrences of the use of יהוה, the self-imprecation itself has the usual אלהים. This suggests that the phrase with אלהים had become worn-out at this stage.

⁽⁸⁾ See A.D. CROWN, "Aposiopesis in the O.T. and the Hebrew Conditional Oath", *Abr-Nahrain* 4 (1963-64) 96-111 (esp. 107-108). However, S.H. BLANK, "The Curse, Blasphemy, the Spell, and the Oath", *HUCA* 23 (1950-51) 73-95 (esp. 89-92), does not assume the word כה to refer to a gesture. On the contrary, he believes that people shied away from being more specific about the nature of the punishment: "The formula is neutral and evasive, as though the oath-taker is reluctant to define the curse" (p. 90). Blank's view is convincingly countered by H.C. BRICHTO, *The Problem of "Curse" in the Hebrew Bible* (JBLMS 13; Philadelphia 1963) 210-211.

else's thigh⁽⁹⁾. However, neither of these gestures seems to express a form of punishment⁽¹⁰⁾.

So far, key evidence has been left out of the debate. Ancient Mesopotamian sources mention a gesture in use when taking an oath. For example in texts from Mari (ca. 1775 B.C.E.), the Akkadian *lapātum napištam* "to touch the throat" is a technical term for taking an oath⁽¹¹⁾. The following passage makes especially clear that the expression bears upon an oath:

Say to my lord: Thus says Yawi-ilā, your servant: My lord wrote as follows to me regarding the sending of the gods: "Send your gods so that I touch my throat." Now then, I have sent the gods. My lord may pronounce the oath of the gods⁽¹²⁾.

Unquestionably, the touching of the throat meant that one was deserving of being killed when breaking the oath⁽¹³⁾. The Akkadian word *napištu* means both "throat" and "life", as does Hebrew נָפֶשׁ. In other words, who touches his throat puts his life at risk. As long as swearing the oath was accompanied by the touching of the throat, the awareness of the ensuing curse for breaking it must undoubtedly have been alive.

What is evident is that the Mesopotamian gods were witnesses to the oath. Apparently, the gods would also execute the punishment in case the oath was broken. In the Hebrew Bible as well, the deity is the subject of the curse.

It does not seem unlikely that the Israelites at some stage used to make a similar gesture when pronouncing the phrase כִּי יֵעָשֶׂה לִּי אֱלֹהִים וְכִי יוֹסִיף (14). The fact that the practice of combining oath-taking with touching the throat was not confined to Mari, but extended to very large parts of Mesopotamia, yields even greater plausibility to this assumption⁽¹⁵⁾.

The Mesopotamians may well have used a phrase similar to the Hebrew self-imprecation while taking an oath and touching the throat. Akkadian oaths are sometimes made up of a subordinate clause introduced by the particle *šumma* "if", without a main clause. Probably, this expression emerged after

(9) Å. VIBERG, *Symbols of Law. A Contextual Analysis of Legal Symbolic Acts in the Old Testament* (CB.OT 34; Stockholm 1992) 19-32, 45-51, with reference to Gen 14,22; 24,9; 47,29; Deut 32,40, etc.

(10) Differently: CROWN, "Aposiopesis", 107: "The gestures of punishment which one can demonstrate by raising the hand are few, limited perhaps to the act of rendering out the tongue, putting out the eyes, or more likely the running of a finger across the throat".

(11) See P. HOSKISSON, "The *Nišum* 'Oath' in Mari", *Mari in Retrospect: Fifty Years of Mari and Mari Studies* (ed. G.D. YOUNG) (Winona Lake, IN, 1992) 203-210. Cf. also KOTTSEPER, "נָפֶשׁ", esp. 976-977; *The Assyrian Dictionary, L* (Chicago 1973) 84-85.

(12) *Archives royales de Mari*, 13, text 147,1-9. Of course, "gods" here refers to the images of the gods.

(13) The expression was also used in connection with the slaughtering of animals; see *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch* (Wiesbaden 1965) I, 535.

(14) See the observation by Crown quoted in n. 10 above.

(15) In the then widely known Babylonian Epic of Creation, even the "great gods" imprecate themselves and touch their throats (*Enuma Elish* VI, 97): "The great gods assembled and made Marduk's destiny highest; they themselves did obeisance. They swore an oath for themselves, and swore on water and oil, touched their throats". Translation by S. DALLEY, *Myths from Mesopotamia* (Oxford – New York 1989) 264. See also *The Assyrian Dictionary*, A2 (Chicago 1968) 234.

the disappearance of the self-imprecation. Hence, it is likely for conditional self-imprecations to have occurred in Mesopotamia as well⁽¹⁶⁾.

It remains doubtful, though, whether the gesture was still in common use among the Israelites in the period during which the Hebrew Bible was written. In the Hebrew Bible, there are no allusions to the touching of the throat in combination with oath-swearing to be found. Besides, if touching the throat were still common practice, there would probably still be a lively awareness of the imprecatory quality of the phrase. The big issue is, however, whether this awareness was still alive then.

3. *Lost awareness*

So far, I have only referred to passages in which they who uttered self-imprecations indeed kept their promises. However, some biblical figures do not live up to their oaths, although they had reinforced their oath with a self-imprecatory phrase. Because they fail their promise, the self-imprecation should take effect. The question is, however, whether the promise-breaker was aware of this, or whether the narrators mention that the person in question was struck by divine punishment. I will now briefly deal with the relevant passages.

A king of the northern kingdom of Israel, whose identity remains unknown, is devastated at seeing how badly the inhabitants of Samaria, under siege by Aramaic troops, are suffering from starvation. Apparently, he blames the prophet Elisha for the gravity of the situation, for he swears to behead him: “So may God do to me and more also, if the head of Elisha, son of Safat, will remain on him today” (2 Kgs 6,31). The king’s malignant plan fails, but remarkably he does not seem to be bothered about his self-imprecation. As Elisha remains alive, the self-imprecation ought to take effect and the king ought to be terror-stricken. However, the king seems to have forgotten completely about his pledge and even the narrator makes no reference to it anymore.

Ahab’s wife Jezebel and Ben-Hadad, king of Aram, use the polytheistic variant of the phrase — “So may the gods do⁽¹⁷⁾ and more also” — to underscore their vicious pledges (1 Kgs 19,2; 20,10). Their plans come to nothing, but they do not seem to be too worried that the gods will punish them now that the self-imprecation should take effect. Also, the narrator is not reminding of the self-imprecation.

Likewise, Saul for once does not abide by his own announcement that he had confirmed on an oath of self-imprecation. 1 Sam 14 tells the story of a battle between the Israelites and the Philistines. Saul requires that the

⁽¹⁶⁾ See W. VON SODEN, *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik* (AnOr 33; Roma 1952) § 185 g-i; W. FARBER, “Wehe, wenn ...!”, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 64 (1975) 177-179. The Hebrew Bible also contains solemn assurances consisting only of a clause beginning with the Hebrew particle אם “if”. For this manner of speaking, it is also assumed that it must be explained from the omission of a self-imprecatory phrase; see W. GESENIUS – E. KAUTZSCH, *Hebräische Grammatik* (Leipzig 281909) § 149; CARTLEDGE, *Vows in the Hebrew Bible*, 15-16. Some doubt is expressed by P. JOÜON – T. MURAOKA, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Subsidia Biblica 14/II; Roma 1991) § 165.

⁽¹⁷⁾ The majority of Masoretic manuscripts omit ל “to me” in 1 Kgs 19,2, while the Septuagint has $\mu\omicron\iota$.

Israelites pronounce an imprecation on the person who will eat something before sunset and before he will have revenged himself on the Philistines (14,24; cf. 14,39). It appears that Jonathan has, quite innocently, taken some honey. He had not been informed of the imprecation. Saul now says that Jonathan must die, and he confirms this on an oath of self-imprecation: "So may God do⁽¹⁸⁾ and more also! Indeed, Jonathan, you shall surely die!" (14,44). Most remarkably, the people manage to induce Saul to think twice. Referring to God in an oath (חַי יְהוָה) "As sure as YHWH is alive", the people swear that not a hair will fall from Jonathan's head (14,45). This leads Saul suddenly to downplay the importance of all previous imprecations, including his own self-imprecation⁽¹⁹⁾.

All in all, the question becomes increasingly pressing: did those, who uttered the self-imprecations, take the threat of their self-imprecation seriously themselves? Or had these utterances essentially degenerated into some worn-out phrase to underscore the oath, without any awareness on the part of the speaker of its literal meaning? In the cases of Jezebel, Ben-Hadad, and Saul as in the case of the Israelite king who wanted Elisha killed, the phrase hardly seems to function anymore as a genuine threat of self-imprecation. Even the narrators of the stories do not seem to mind the earlier phrasal utterances of self-imprecation.

A relevant and illuminating passage, that I have omitted so far, is 1 Sam 25,22. The Masoretic text has David swearing to kill a group of men — members of the Nabal clan. David reinforces his oath using a surprising variant of the imprecatory phrase: כֹּה יַעֲשֶׂה אֱלֹהִים לְאִיבֵי דָוִד וְכֹה יִסַּף אִם אֲשֹׁמֵר: "So may God do *to David's enemies* and more also, if before the morning I will have left of all who belong to him even one alive who urinates against the wall"⁽²⁰⁾. Evidently, the way in which the imprecation appears in this particular case, does not seem to make sense.

The Septuagint has a reading that implies a *self*-imprecation: Τάδε ποιήσῃς ὁ Θεὸς τῷ Δαυὶδ καὶ τάδε προσθεῖη "So will God do *to David* and more". It is generally assumed, on good grounds, that the Septuagint reading stems from an earlier Hebrew reading than the Masoretic reading. In early Judaism, the older reading לְדָוִד "to David" was replaced with לְאִיבֵי דָוִד "to David's enemies"⁽²¹⁾.

As the story continues, David does not keep his promise, because of

⁽¹⁸⁾ Some of the Masoretic manuscripts omit לִי "to me". The Septuagint does have μου.

⁽¹⁹⁾ For the possibility of undoing an imprecation with a blessing, see also Judg 17,1-2 and the *Epic of Gilgamesh*, VII, 151-153.

⁽²⁰⁾ S. TALMON – W.W. FIELDS, "The Collocation בְּקִיר וְעֶצֶר וְעֶזֶב and its Meaning", ZAW 101 (1989) 85-112, propose the translation: "one who urinates in the upper chamber". The expression would not refer to men in general, but to "a person, predominantly of royal status, who had the privilege of using, and of relieving himself in, a private upper chamber" (p. 101).

⁽²¹⁾ See S.R. DRIVER, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford 1913) 299; C. MCCARTHY, *The Targum Sopherim and Other Theological Corrections in the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament* (OBO 36; Fribourg – Göttingen 1981) 188-189; D. BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament* (OBO 50/1; Fribourg – Göttingen 1982) I, 213. Unfortunately, the passage does not occur on the ancient fragments from Qumran and other parts of the Judean desert. The Peshitta reads לְעַבְדָּהּ דָּוִד "for his servant David", which is in agreement with the reading of the Septuagint.

altered circumstances. However, nothing points to any concern on David's part that he had used words of self-imprecation. On the contrary, he is relieved for not having to kill Nabal's men.

Those who copied the texts could not believe that as pious a king as David would dismiss his oath so readily without begging from God to invalidate his self-imprecation. For less God-fearing kings, such as Saul and Ben-Hadad, and for the evil queen Jezebel, such negligent behaviour was apparently taken for granted. David's reputation, however, needed to be salvaged. Besides, those who copied the text could, if necessary, interpret the tragic deaths of Saul and Jezebel⁽²²⁾ as the fulfilment of the self-imprecation, even though this interpretation is not suggested by the biblical text itself.

The older reading of 1 Sam 25,22 confirms the impression that the self-imprecatory phrase had lost much of its original meaning at a rather early stage. On the other hand, the later textual alteration of 1 Sam 25,22 reveals that certain copyists were indeed inclined to take the self-imprecation literally.

In 1 Sam 25 and in several other cases mentioned above, the speakers did not keep their oaths, though stressed by self-imprecation. They seem to have been unaware of the original meaning of the phrase. In these cases, it is not very likely that the verbal act of self-imprecation was still accompanied by a gesture indicating a certain cause of death. However, those who kept the promise, which they had reinforced by uttering the phrase, may also have been unaware that the phrase was in fact self-imprecatory.

We may conclude that the phrase *כֹּה יַעֲשֶׂה לִי אֱלֹהִים וְכֹה יוֹסִיף* and its variants expressed a firm intention. It seems that those using the phrase were quite determined to keep the oath following the self-imprecation at the very moment they pronounced it. One may wonder whether the self-imprecators could not have anticipated how difficult it might eventually prove to live up to their promise. However, no instance in the Hebrew Bible intimates that the self-imprecation would take effect automatically if the promise was broken⁽²³⁾. The supposed earlier version of 1 Sam 25,22 suggests that breaking a promise when circumstances had changed, was sometimes considered acceptable. However, in the case of the king of the northern kingdom, Jezebel and Ben-Hadad, the narrators seem to mention their self-imprecations on purpose, thus mocking their overconfidence.

4. *Confined later resistance*

It is not clear for how long the Hebrew self-imprecatory phrase, or its possible Aramaic or Greek counterparts, remained in use. The New Testament contains no expression that resembles the Hebrew phrase. Yet we may assume that the self-imprecatory phrase had not yet become obsolete.

⁽²²⁾ See 1 Sam 31; 2 Kgs 9,30-37.

⁽²³⁾ Others have suggested that in the Hebrew Bible, imprecations, once uttered, would take effect automatically; cf. J. HEMPEL, "Die israelitischen Anschauungen von Segen und Fluch im Lichte altorientalischer Parallelen", *ZDMG, Neue Folge* 4 (1925) 20-110; BLANK, "The Curse, Blasphemy, the Spell, and the Oath", 73-95; I. KOTTISIEPER, "Zur Etymologie von hebr. *šb' l'*", *UF* 22 (1990) 149-168.

Acts 23 mentions that a group of more than forty men are plotting an attack on Paul. They take the solemn oath not to take any food before they have succeeded in assassinating Paul (Acts 23,14.21). The conspirators utter a form of self-imprecation⁽²⁴⁾. It is very well possible that they used the Old Testament phrase: "So may God do to me and more also, if I take any food or drink before we have killed Paul"⁽²⁵⁾. As the story continues, Paul escapes being murdered. As a consequence, his enemies are forced to break their oath to abstain from food and drink. As in the case of Jezebel, Ben-Hadad and the anonymous king of the northern kingdom of Israel, the narrator seems to mock the conspirators' overconfidence⁽²⁶⁾.

The question arises whether both Acts 23 and the Masoretic version of 1 Sam 25,22 do not also mirror resistance against the use of the self-imprecation in itself. Such resistance would not be inconceivable, since the interpretation of the Third Commandment came to be progressively uncompromising.

The Third Commandment (Exod 20,7; Deut 5,11) makes it clear that those, who abuse the name of YHWH, are considered punishable by him. It is not clear, however, to which kinds of abuse of God's name the commandment exactly refers. At the time when the Hebrew Bible was being composed, the commandment seems to have had a relatively small scope, though this abuse evidently included the use of God's name to underscore false oaths⁽²⁷⁾. However, as I have indicated above, there are no signs that the narrators considered the use of the Hebrew self-imprecation כִּה יַעֲשֶׂה לִי אֱלֹהִים וְכִה יוֹסִיף as a way of abusing God's name. Reinforcing an oath by self-imprecation seemed quite an acceptable thing to do.

In the last centuries B.C.E. and in the first century C.E., the Third Commandment was seen to apply to more situations. More and more, people avoided the use of the name יְהוָה (YHWH) and there was growing criticism of the use of oaths as such⁽²⁸⁾. In a similar spirit, Jesus takes a radical stand against the use of oaths, and his disapproval concerns sacred and less sacred purposes alike (Matt 5,33-37; cf. Jas 5,12).

⁽²⁴⁾ Acts 23,14: ἀναθέματι ἀνεθεματίσαμεν ἑαυτούς.

⁽²⁵⁾ Cf. F.F. BRUCE, *The Book of the Acts* (NICNT; Grand Rapids 1988) 431. Bruce's view seems cogent on the grounds that also in 2 Sam 3,35, the self-imprecatory phrase reinforces a pledge to abstain from food. Cf. also 1 Sam 14,24 with 1 Sam 14,44.

⁽²⁶⁾ It is doubtful whether Mark 14,71 and Matt 26,74 also make allusions that Peter used the phrase from the Old Testament to stress that he does not know Jesus. Perhaps Peter cursed Jesus, or maybe even the bystanders who had got him into this delicate situation. See further C.S. MANN, *Mark. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB; New York 1986) 632; W.D. DAVIES – D.C. ALLISON, *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew* (ICC; Edinburgh 1997) III, 548.

⁽²⁷⁾ See T. VEIJOLA, "Das dritte Gebot (Namenverbot) im Lichte einer ägyptischen Parallele", ZAW 103 (1991) 1-17; W.H. SCHMIDT, *Die Zehn Gebote im Rahmen alttestamentlicher Ethik* (EdF 281; Darmstadt 1993) 80-82; both with reference to Lev 19,12; Hos 4,2; 10,4; Ps 24,4 (MT), as well as the relevant Egyptian inscription of Nefer abu.

⁽²⁸⁾ See Sir 23,9-11; Philo of Alexandria, *De decalogo*, § 82-95. Cf. also SCHMIDT, *Die Zehn Gebote*, 84-85, as well as the early Jewish literature mentioned by P. LAPIDE, *Die Bergpredigt. Utopie oder Programm?* (Mainz 1982) 72-78; R.P. MARTIN, *James* (WBC; Waco 1988) 200, 204; W.D. DAVIES – D.C. ALLISON, *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew* (ICC; Edinburgh 1988) I, 534-535; VEIJOLA, "Das dritte Gebot", 14.

Especially against the background of more and more expressions being regarded as instances of abuse of God's name, it is striking that only in 1 Sam 25,22 the self-imprecation seems to have been modified on purpose. Moreover, neither the earliest Jewish translations nor the earliest Christian translations of the Hebrew Bible (Septuagint, Targumim, Vulgate and Peshitta) show any traces of opposition against the phrase. To a high degree, the rendering of the Hebrew text is literal. Only in some isolated cases are there minor deviations from the Hebrew text. These deviations, however, can certainly not be ascribed to the self-imprecation being conceived as the abuse of God's name.

All in all, there are no grounds on which to assume that the phrase *כִּי יַעֲשֶׂה לִּי אֱלֹהִים וְכִי יוֹסִיף* as such was met with resistance in early Jewish and early Christian circles. However, the textual alteration in 1 Sam 25,22 shows that there was opposition to the practice of reinforcing a promise using the self-imprecatory phrase, if the speaker proved to fail his promise later.

Paulus Potterlaan 69
2282 GE Rijswijk
The Netherlands

Paul SANDERS

SUMMARY

In the Hebrew Bible we find the self-imprecation "So may God do to me and more also!" (2 Sam 3,35, 1 Kgs 2,23, etc.). In many cases, the phrase is immediately conditioned: "So may God do to me and more also, *if* you will not be the commander of the army" (2 Sam 19,14). God may punish the speaker, if the latter fails his promise. Ancient Mesopotamian sources suggest that the word "So" in the Hebrew expression originally referred to a gesture in use when taking an oath: the touching of the throat. The biblical passages where the expression occurs do not display any resistance to the use of the formula as such, even though it was often pronounced inconsiderately. However, the textual alteration in 1 Sam 25,22 shows that there was opposition to the idea that the pious king David failed a promise that he had reinforced using the self-imprecatory phrase.

Hab 3 in intertextueller und kontextueller Sicht

Hab 3 bietet außergewöhnliche sprachliche und literarische Schwierigkeiten, die intensive text- und literarkritische sowie religionsgeschichtliche Bearbeitung erfordern⁽¹⁾ und unterschiedlichste entstehungsgeschichtliche Theorien provozierten⁽²⁾. Die Entwicklung der Forschung innerhalb des letzten Jahrzehnts⁽³⁾ eröffnet neue Blickrichtungen auf Hab 3: Synchrone Untersuchungen erweisen bisher weitgehend unbeachtete Beziehungen des Kapitels zu Hab 1–2⁽⁴⁾ und erste intertextuelle Analysen zeigen Hab 3 in Abhängigkeit von anderen alttestamentlichen Texten⁽⁵⁾. Dieser Beitrag möchte beide Ansätze verbinden und weiterführen. Zunächst aber sind methodologische Grundlagen anzusprechen.

1. Kriterien zur Bewertung intertextueller Beziehungen

In Abgrenzung zu einer weiten Auffassung des Intertextualitätsbegriffes untersuche ich im folgenden einzeltextreferentielle „Produktionsintertextualität“⁽⁶⁾. Dafür empfehlen sich die Kriterien des Anglisten Manfred Pfister⁽⁷⁾. Sein für die Analyse v. a. (post)moderner literarischer Werke konzipiertes Modell beinhaltet sechs qualitative Kriterien, die sich für unsere Erfordernisse auf fünf reduzieren lassen⁽⁸⁾: Die intertextuelle Beziehung ist demnach umso intensiver,

(1) F.I. ANDERSEN, *Habakkuk* (AncB 25; New York 2001) 260, 264–265.

(2) P. JÖCKEN, *Das Buch Habakuk*. Darstellung der Geschichte seiner kritischen Erforschung mit einer eigenen Beurteilung (BBB 48; Köln-Bonn 1977).

(3) S. dazu O. DANGL, „Habakkuk in Recent Research“, *CR:BS* 9 (2001) 131–168.

(4) G.T.M. PRINSLOO, „Reading Habakkuk as a literary unit: Exploring the possibilities“, *OTEs* 12 (1999) 515–535, B. HUWYLER, „Habakuk und seine Psalmen“, *Prophetie und Psalmen*. FS K. Seybold (Hg. B. HUWYLER – H.-P. MATHYS – B. WEBER) (AOAT 280; Münster 2001) 231–259, v.a. 250–259, und B.Y. LEIGH, *A rhetorical and structural study of the Book of Habakkuk* (Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary 1992).

(5) Y. AVISHUR, *Studies in Hebrew and Ugaritic Psalms* (Jerusalem 1994) 133–142 und G.T.M. PRINSLOO, „Yahweh the warrior: An intertextual reading of Habakkuk 3“, *OTEs* 14 (2001) 475–493. Letztere Studie geht von einem weiteren Begriff der Intertextualität aus, als er hier im Blick ist (s. 1).

(6) Vgl. R. LACHMANN, *Gedächtnis und Literatur* (Frankfurt a. M. 1990) 57, und B. TRIMPE, *Von der Schöpfung bis zur Zerstreuung*. Intertextuelle Interpretationen der biblischen Urgeschichte (Gen 1–11) (Osnabrücker Studien zur Jüdischen und Christlichen Bibel 1; Osnabrück 2000) 17–54, v.a. 39–42.

(7) M. PFISTER, „Konzepte der Intertextualität“, *Intertextualität*. Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien (Hg. U. BROICH) (Konzepte der Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft 35; Tübingen 1985) 1–30, bes. 26–30. Für die Analyse biblischer Texte wurden diese Kriterien z.B. schon von J. OESCH, „Intertextuelle Untersuchungen zum Bezug von Offb 21,1–22,5 auf alttestamentliche Prätexte“, *Protokolle zur Bibel* 8 (1999) 41–74 angewandt.

(8) Pfisters drittes Kriterium „Autoreflexivität“, das die Thematisierung von Intertextualität als Verfahren bezeichnet, dürfte in der Bibel – anders als in moderner oder postmoderner Literatur – kaum vorkommen.

- je stärker der Prätext thematisiert und nicht einfach nur verwendet wird⁽⁹⁾ (Referentialität),
- je klarer der Autor die intertextuelle Referenz kommunikativ transparent gestaltet, d. h. je wahrscheinlicher er die Bekanntheit des Prätextes voraussetzen kann und je deutlicher er durch eine bewusste Markierung auf jenen verweist (Kommunikativität),
- je mehr mit dem übernommenen Textelement auch dessen strukturelle Funktion vom alten auf den neuen Kontext übertragen wird (Strukturalität),
- je prägnanter die sprachliche Gestalt des intertextuellen Verweises ist (Selektivität) und
- je “stärker der ursprüngliche und der neue Zusammenhang in semantischer und ideologischer Spannung zueinander stehen”⁽¹⁰⁾ (Dialogizität).

Zusätzlich sind quantitative Kriterien zu berücksichtigen, nämlich “zum einen die Dichte und Häufigkeit der intertextuellen Bezüge, zum anderen die Zahl und Streubreite der ins Spiel gebrachten Prätexte”⁽¹¹⁾.

Bei der Untersuchung kanonischer Texte kann die Selektivität intertextueller Beziehungen durch die Konkordanzstatistik verifiziert werden⁽¹²⁾: Je geringer die Häufigkeit verbindender Textelemente und je größer ihr Umfang, umso höher ist die Wahrscheinlichkeit bewusster Einzeltextreferenz. Höchste intertextuelle Relevanz besitzen daher prägnante sprachliche Ausdrücke bzw. Wendungen, die nur an zwei Stellen auftreten. Solche Fälle sind hier mit Georg Fischer als ‘exklusive Verbindungen’ bezeichnet⁽¹³⁾. Anders als in Werken der Gegenwartsliteratur stellt sich bei biblischen Texten (besonders innerhalb des Alten Testaments) häufig die Frage nach der Richtung der Abhängigkeit bzw. Bezugnahme. Hier können die Kriterien Referentialität, Kommunikativität und Dialogizität zu einer Klärung beitragen.

2. *Hab 3 als Kontrasttext zu Dtn 33; 2 Sam 22 // Ps 18*

Anhand der dargestellten Kriterien analysiere ich die intertextuellen Verbindungen zwischen Hab 3 und Dtn 33 bzw. 2 Sam 22, was bisher erst in Ansätzen geschah⁽¹⁴⁾.

Der Mosesegen Dtn 33 ist gemeinsam mit dem Moselied Dtn 32 in poetischer Verdichtung als theologischer Vermächnistext gestaltet⁽¹⁵⁾,

⁽⁹⁾ Zugrunde liegt die “linguistische Unterscheidung von *use* und *mention* bzw. *refer to*” (PFISTER, “Konzepte”, 28).

⁽¹⁰⁾ PFISTER, “Konzepte”, 29.

⁽¹¹⁾ PFISTER, “Konzepte”, 30.

⁽¹²⁾ Dies gilt freilich nur in eingeschränktem Maße, da uns viele für die biblischen Autoren zeitgenössische Texte nicht mehr zugänglich sind.

⁽¹³⁾ Als exemplarische Durchführung s. G. FISCHER, *Das Trostbüchlein*. Text, Komposition und Theologie von Jer 30–31 (SBB 26; Stuttgart 1993) 186–224.

⁽¹⁴⁾ AVISHUR, *Studies*, 133–142, bes. 132–133, und ANDERSEN, *Habakkuk*, 300–301, 330.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Literarisch und thematisch sind beide Dichtungen aufeinander bezogen – vgl. S. BEYERLE, *Der Mosesegen im Deuteronomium* (BZAW 250; Berlin 1997) 285–288. AVISHUR, *Studies*, 138–139, nimmt eine direkte Bezugnahme von Hab 3,10.11b–14a auf Dtn 32,40–43 an, was aber wegen der allzu unterschiedlichen kontextuellen Verortung der parallelen Motive nicht überzeugen kann.

dessen zentrale Segenssprüche Dtn 33,6-25 (anders als im Paralleltext Gen 49,3-27) durch die hymnischen Stücke Dtn 33,2-5,26-29 gerahmt sind. Am Beginn stehen Sinaitheophanie und Toragabe (VV. 1.4), zum Ende Rettungstheophanie und sicheres Wohnen im Land (VV. 26-29). Beide Dimensionen der Vergewärtigung Gottes bilden den tragenden Rahmen des Stämmesegens. Die äußersten Eckformulierungen dieses Rahmens in Dtn 33,2.29 wiederum weisen jeweils exklusive Verbindungen zu Hab 3,3.19 auf:

	exklusive Verbindung	verstärkende Parallelen
Dtn 33,2 – Hab 3,3	דָּרַךְ (-)פֶּאֶרֶן	Präp. מִן, Gottes Kommen (בֹּא) als erste Verbalaussage des Verses
Dtn 33,29 – Hab 3,19	עַל + בְּמָה + דָּרַךְ ⁽¹⁶⁾	בְּמָה Pl. mit Pronominalsuffix

Mit Exklusivität und Umfang der Beziehungen ist hohe Selektivität gegeben. Besonders signifikant aber ist die Strukturalität der Verbindungen. Dtn 33,2; Hab 3,3 stehen jeweils themasetzend zu Beginn eines größeren Textabschnittes und Dtn 33,29; Hab 3,19 bilden in beiden Texten das Schlussmotiv. Inhaltlich gewinnt dies noch im Blick auf das räumliche Gesamtkonzept beider Texte an Bedeutung, das sich im Sinn eines Abstieg-Aufstieg-Schemas verstehen lässt. Die Theophanie vom Berg Paran her zielt jeweils hin zum sicheren Stehen der befreiten Person „auf Höhen“ (עַל בְּמָה).

Bewusste literarische Anspielung scheint im ganzen höchst wahrscheinlich. Welcher Text aber lag dem anderen vor? Zunächst deutet sich Hab 3 durch seine innere referentielle Struktur als rezipierender Text an: Indem die Wahrnehmung des Beters mit „ich habe gehört“ (שָׁמַעְתִּי) + Verb des Fürchtens eine Inklusion zwischen V. 2ab und V. 16 bildet und sich so wie die Bitten V. 2d-e auf die Theophanie VV. 3-15 bezieht, ist letztere als „Text im Text“ hervorgehoben⁽¹⁷⁾. Durch diese sublime, aber intensive Form der Referentialität wird der Leser bzw. Hörer auf den intertextuellen Verweis vorbereitet, den der markante Beginn von V. 3 mit sich bringt. Zudem ist für Dtn 33 in späterer Zeit ein hoher Bekanntheitsgrad und identitätsstiftende Funktion anzunehmen, was als Faktor für die Kommunikativität starke Eignung als Prätext mit sich bringt. Die Dialogizität der Bezugnahme zeigt sich schließlich in den Differenzen zwischen beiden Texten: Im Detail gestaltet Hab 3,3 das einleitende Trikolon aus Dtn 33,2 zu einem Bikolon um. Statt des einen Subjektes יְהוָה verwendet Habakuk die Epitheta אֱלֹהִים und קְדוֹשׁ⁽¹⁸⁾, statt der beiden ersten Herkunftsangaben מִסִּינַי und מִשְׁעֵרִי allgemeiner und zusammenfassend מִתִּימָן. Von den drei Verben בָּא, וָרָחַ וְהוֹפִיעַ

⁽¹⁶⁾ Die Formulierung דָּרַךְ עַל-בְּמָה אֶרֶץ/ים (Am 4,13; Mi 1,3; Ijob 9,8) zeigt zwar denselben Wortbestand, unterscheidet sich aber wesentlich hinsichtlich Wortfolge, Formenbildung und Bedeutung.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Zur Struktur von Hab 3 s. W. RUDOLPH, *Micha, Nahum, Habakuk, Zephania* (KAT 13,3; Gütersloh 1975) 239-248, und mit ausgezeichnete graphischer Darstellung ANDERSEN, *Habakkuk* 261.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Die Verwendung der Gottesbezeichnungen יְהוָה, אֱלֹהִים und קְדוֹשׁ in Hab 3,2-3 verbindet die Stelle stark mit Hab 1,11f. אֱלֹהִים und קְדוֹשׁ begegnen einzeln hauptsächlich bei Jesaja und Ijob, gemeinsam sonst nur in Ijob 6,9f, wodurch sich diese Gottesbezeichnungen im alttestamentlichen Kontext gerade nicht als „ancient names for God“ erweisen (gegen ANDERSEN, *Habakkuk*, 289).

übernimmt Hab 3,3 — ebenfalls zusammenfassend — nur בוא, jedoch in Präformativkonjugation. Sowohl die Vermeidung des Stichwortes “Sinai”, als auch die Verwendung der Präformativkonjugation umgehen die Exodusreminiszenz zugunsten einer neuen, präsentischen Theophanie “inmitten der Jahre” (V. 2). Nicht dass Gott gekommen ist, steht hier im Zentrum des Interesses, sondern dass er kommen soll und wird. Die martialische und erobergewisse Schlusssatz von Dtn 33,29 “und du [sc. Israel] wirst auf ihre [sc. der Feinde] Höhen treten” akzentuiert Hab 3,19 wesentlich bescheidener auf das Handeln Gottes und die Sicherheit des Sprechers um: “Und auf meine Höhen wird er [sc. Gott] mich [sc. den paradigmatischen Beter] treten lassen”. Im Gesamttext kommt es zur Verschiebung vom Segen ברכה hin zum Gebet תפלה (jeweils V. 1): Während die Theophanie den tragenden Rahmen von Dtn 33 bildet, in dessen Zentrum der Stämmesegen steht, rückt in Hab 3 die Theophanie in die Mitte, gerahmt von Gebetsteilen. Hier erschließt sich die Gesamtintention der intertextuellen Referenz. Hab 3 nimmt den klassischen theologischen Konsolidierungstext Dtn 33 auf, um ihn in der Situation völlig ausbleibenden Segens zu einem Text theologischer Krisenbewältigung umzugestalten. Eine neue Theophanie gilt es zu erleben (Hab 3,2), um das Gottesvolk dem völligen Untergang zu entreißen (V. 13) und mit friedfertigeren Ansprüchen eine neue Identität zu gewinnen (V. 19)⁽¹⁹⁾.

Ähnlich gestaltet sich das Verhältnis von Hab 3 zu dem zweiten hier zu behandelnden Text. Der komplexe Psalm 2 Sam 22 wird von der theophanischen Rettung (VV. 5-20) und dem kriegerischen Sieg (VV. 33-46) des königlichen Beters beherrscht; beide gründen in dessen zentral behandelten, reinen Gottesbeziehung (VV. 21-30) und rufen sowohl im theologischen Fokus VV. 31-32 als auch im inneren Rahmen VV. 2-4.47-50 Bekenntnis und Lob hervor⁽²⁰⁾.

Die literarische Verbindung unseres Interesses besteht zwischen Hab 3,19b-c und 2 Sam 22,34. Die beiden Verse sind — abgesehen von den beiden nur bedeutungsähnlichen Verbalwurzeln⁽²¹⁾ — wortgleich: “Er setzte/ist ähnlich machend [משוה bzw. יושם] meine Füße wie Hindinnen und auf meine Höhen lässt er mich schreiten/treten [יעמדני bzw. ידרכני]”. Die exklusive Verbindung durch den Vergleich “meine Füße wie Hindinnen” und der Gesamtumfang der Parallele bedingen hohe Selektivität⁽²²⁾. Wenn auch die Tatsache der intertextuellen Bezugnahme kaum in Zweifel zu ziehen ist, stellt sich wiederum die Frage nach der Richtung der Abhängigkeit. Da 2 Sam 22,1-51; 23,1-7 — vergleichbar mit Dtn 32; 33 — als Vermächtnistexte

⁽¹⁹⁾ Eine ähnliche Tendenz zur Aktualisierung scheint Hab 3 gegenüber Ps 44 einzunehmen: Hab 3 teilt mit Ps 44 als einzigem Text des Psalters den Beginn mit Gottesanrede und folgendem Bericht dessen, was über Gott gehört worden war (zum “genre of lament psalms which quote hymns” vgl. AVISHUR, *Studies*, 113). Während aber Ps 44 eine vergangene (VV. 3-9) und die gegenwärtige Situation (VV. 10-23) berichtet, um erst dann den Rettungsimperativ zu formulieren (VV. 24-27), setzt Hab 3,2 schon imperativisch ein und macht so den Bericht VV. 3-15 gleichzeitig zum Gegenstand der Bitte um Rettung.

⁽²⁰⁾ Der äußere Rahmen VV. 1.51 gewährleistet die davidische Situierung des Textes.

⁽²¹⁾ In der textkritischen Frage des Suffixes von רגל ist mit dem Qere der Masora und Ps 18,34 für רגלי (gegen רגלי) zu entscheiden.

⁽²²⁾ Zusätzlich verbindet Hab 3,19a ידחי אדני חילי mit 2 Sam 22,33 חיל מעוזי חילי.

Davids figurieren⁽²³⁾, ist für diese Dichtungen ähnlich hohe diskursive Relevanz vorauszusetzen, was durch die Parallelüberlieferung von 2 Sam 22 in Ps 18 noch deutlicher wird. Dass darin der Prätext anzunehmen ist, zeigt sich aber vor allem an der kontextuell wesentlich homogeneren und daher wohl ursprünglicheren Einbettung des parallelen Stichos hier: Die VV. 33-46 sind thematisch verbunden — der Beter besingt seine Zurüstung durch Gott zum Sieg gegen Feinde. Dazu kommt die syntaktisch parallele Gestaltung der VV. 33-35⁽²⁴⁾ und die motivliche Fortsetzung von “meine Füße” (רגלי V. 34) mit “meine Hände” und “meine Arme” (זרעתי/ידי) in V. 35. Dagegen bringt Hab 3,19 das einzige Waw-Imperfekt (וישם) neben V. 6 und die einzige Beschreibung des direkten Handelns Gottes am Beter innerhalb des Kapitels, was inhaltlich wie stilistisch einen spürbaren Wechsel bedeutet. Dieser Befund ist nicht als Anlass zur literarkritischen Scheidung, sondern viel eher als literarisches Mittel zur Markierung der Intertextualität zu werten⁽²⁵⁾: Die Irritation durch die Besonderheiten des Stichos weckt beim Leser bzw. Hörer die Aufmerksamkeit dafür, dass das Textelement aus einem anderen Zusammenhang stammt, den er zu erinnern und mitzudeuten vermag⁽²⁶⁾.

Welche konzeptionelle Logik aber verfolgt Hab 3 im “Dialog” mit 2 Sam 22? Während in 2 Sam 22 dem Bericht von der theophanischen Rettung (VV. 5-20) ein etwa gleich umfangreiches Siegeslied folgt (VV. 33-46), eröffnet die in Hab 3 voll ins Zentrum gesetzte Theophanie (VV. 3-15), welche die Wahrnehmung und das Befinden des Beters prägt und wandelt (VV. 2.16-18) nur den zaghaften Ausblick auf einen Zustand strategischer Sicherheit. V. 19 wählt dazu aus 2 Sam 22,33-46 den poetisch wohl schillerndsten V. 34, gleichzeitig den einzigen ohne klar militärisches Vokabular. Habakuk setzt trotz der beinahe wörtlichen Übernahme eines Stichos vollkommen neue Akzente: Nicht mehr der vollkommene König (2 Sam 22,21-30) hat sich über “sein Volk” und Fremdvölker zu behaupten (2 Sam 22,44), sondern nur der bittende und leidende Prophet (Hab 3,2.16) kann die Rettung des Volkes Gottes und seines Gesalbten (משיחו Hab 3,13, vgl. 2 Sam 22,51) herbeiführen.

Hab 3 spielt in den VV. 3.19 mit Dtn 33 und 2 Sam 22 auf die bedeutendsten Vermächtnistexte zweier Großgestalten Israels an. Die intertextuelle Bezugnahme überträgt gleichzeitig die Autorität und stellvertretende Funktion des paradigmatischen Propheten Mose⁽²⁷⁾ und des

⁽²³⁾ Vgl. E. ZENGER, “Mose/Moselied/Mosesege/Moseschriften I. Altes Testament”, *TRE* 23, 330-341, hier 338: “Die Abfolge ‚Lied‘ (Dtn 32) – ‚Segen‘ (Dtn 33) entspricht der Abfolge ‚Psalm Davids‘ (II Sam 22) – ‚letzte Worte Davids‘ (II Sam 23,1-7)”.

⁽²⁴⁾ Der erste Halbvers besteht jeweils aus einem Nominalsatz mit einem Gottesprädikat als Subjekt, der zweite aus einem Verbalsatz unter Beibehaltung des Subjektes.

⁽²⁵⁾ S. dazu U. BROICH, “Formen der Markierung von Intertextualität”, *Intertextualität* (Hg. U. BROICH) 31-47, hier 42.

⁽²⁶⁾ Geht man von dieser Richtung der Abhängigkeit aus, ist auch die Veränderung der Verbalwurzeln zu begründen: דרך steht statt עמד um der Anspielung auf Dtn 33,29 willen (vgl. oben); die Variation von משה zu ישם schafft eine kontextuelle Verbindung zu Hab 2,9. Dort ist שם ebenso mit Metaphorik aus der Tierwelt (“Nest”, vgl. “Füße wie Hirschen” 3,19) und dem strategischen Motiv “Höhe” (מרום, vgl. במה 3,19) verbunden. Der durch Gott erhöhte Beter aus Hab 3,19 erscheint so als positives Gegenteil des Frevlers aus 2,9, der selbst “... sein Nest in die Höhe setzt”.

⁽²⁷⁾ Als Maßstab der Prophetie erscheint Mose in Dtn 18,15-22; 34,10-12, zudem

psalmodierenden Königs David auf die Gestalt Habakuks. Gleichzeitig kehrt sie durch feinfühligke Veränderungen die martialisch-ideologischen Anklänge beider Referenztexte zu bescheidener Hoffnung auf Sicherheit um⁽²⁸⁾.

3. Hab 3 als Zieltext des Habakukbuches

Hab 3 nimmt aufgrund der eigenen Überschrift V. 1 und seiner besonderen Gestalt gegenüber den ersten beiden Kapiteln eine relativ eigenständige Position ein⁽²⁹⁾. Gleichzeitig ist der Psalm mit dem vorangehenden Text auf vielfältige Weise verbunden und erfüllt eine komplexe Funktion im Buchzusammenhang. Hier scheint mir zunächst das Verhältnis der Theophanie Hab 3,3-15 zum in Hab 1,5-11 angekündigten Angriff der Chaldäer von besonderem Interesse. Auch letztere Stelle ist nur von einigen intertextuellen Gesichtspunkten her gut verständlich, die ich deshalb zuerst darstelle.

Die stark emphatische⁽³⁰⁾ Redeeinleitung Hab 1,5 „Hört in den Völkern und schaut...“ zeigt große Ähnlichkeiten zu Jes 52,15–53,1⁽³¹⁾ und Ps 44,2⁽³²⁾. Jeweils könnte es sich um invertierte Bezugnahmen handeln⁽³³⁾, wobei die Inversion im ersten Fall doppelt erscheint:

Jes 52,15–53,1	מי האמין → אשר לא יספר להם ראו → גוים
Hab 1,5	לא האמינו כי יספר → ראו בגוים
Ps 44,2	פעל פעלה בימיהם → אבותינו ספרו לנו
Hab 1,5	כִּי־פִעַל פִּעַל בִּימֵיכֶם לֹא־הָאִמְנִינוּ כִּי־יִסְפֹּר

Während aber in beiden Vergleichstexten erfreuliche „Mitteilungen“ (ספר) folgen (Jes 53,2-12 bzw. Ps 44,3-9), bringt Hab 1,6-11 eine Gerichtsansage. Die thematisierende Wendung והנני + Part. hat bei etwa 125 Vorkommen im Tanach nur fünf Mal (Gen 41,17; Num 24,14; Jer 40,10; 42,4; Dan 8,19) nicht Gott zum Subjekt. Spätestens hier wird dem Hörer

durch seine Autorität als „Zeuge für Jahwe“; s. G. FISCHER, „Das Mosebild der hebräischen Bibel“, *Mose. Ägypten und das Alte Testament* (Hg. E. OTTO) (SBS 189; Stuttgart 2000) 84-121, bes. 91-94, 101-104.

⁽²⁸⁾ Die Bezugnahmen auf jene zwei gegen Ende großer Textkorpora stehenden Dichtungen scheinen auch Nachdruck auf die Abschlussfunktion von Hab 3 zu legen.

⁽²⁹⁾ Hab 1-2 ist nach dem Kriterium der Kommunikationsentwicklung gemäß der Kapitelgrenzen in zwei größere Einheiten strukturiert. Hab 1 besteht aus der Überschrift V. 1 und dem (fiktiven) Dialog VV. 2-4.5-11.12-17, Hab 2 aus dem Monolog V. 1 und der Antwort JHWHs VV. 2-20, welche die Wehe-Worte VV. 6b-20 in Zitatform einschließt. Vgl. ANDERSEN, *Habakkuk*, 15, und mit gewichtiger Argumentation PRINSLOO, „Reading“, 520-526.

⁽³⁰⁾ Siehe besonders die climax ad maius innerhalb der ersten vier Verben (LEIGH, *Habakkuk*, 96-98).

⁽³¹⁾ Beide Texte betonen die Unglaublichkeit (אמן hi.) von Erzähltem (ספר pu.), das doch in Völkern (גוים) gesehen (ראוה) werden soll.

⁽³²⁾ Die etymologische Konstruktion mit פעל verbindet die Stellen exklusiv, zusätzlich die Wurzeln יסר und ספר.

⁽³³⁾ Vgl. P.C. BEENTJES, „Discovering a new path of intertextuality: Inverted quotations and their dynamics“, *Literary structure and rhetorical strategies in the Hebrew Bible* (Hg. L.J. REGT – J. WAARD – J.P. FOKKELMAN) (Assen 1996) 31-50.

deutlich, dass Hab 1,5-11 — nicht explizit einem Sprecher zugeordnet — in Form einer prophetischen Gottesrede gestaltet ist. Die folgende Ankündigung der Erhebung der Chaldäer über die Adressaten zeigt starke Verbindungen mit Jer 5,15-17⁽³⁴⁾: Zu den nominalen Aussagen über das Volk mit vorangestelltem *הָנִי* (ה) bzw. nachgestelltem *הוּא* Jer 5,15 // Hab 1,6-7 kommen die thematisch parallel verwendeten Worte *אָכַל* (Jer 5,17 // Hab 1,8) und *מִבְּצָר* (Jer 5,17 // Hab 1,10), wodurch die Verbindung im ganzen hohe Selektivität und Strukturalität erhält:

Jer 5,15-17	Hab 1,6-8
הָנִי מֵבִיא עֲלֵיכֶם	כִּידְהֲנִי מִקֵּים אֲחִי-הַכַּשְׂדִּים
נִי מִמְּרָחֵק... נִי אֵיחָן הוּא נִי מֵעוֹלָם הוּא	הָנִי הַמֶּר וְהַנְּמֹר... אִים וְנֹרָא הוּא
← ... וְאָכַל	← ... לֹאכֹל

Weitere Momente von Hab 1,8 weisen nach Jer 4–5 und verstärken damit die literarische Beziehung quantitativ⁽³⁵⁾:

Hab 1,8a // Jer 4,13	קָלוּ מְנַשְׂרִים סוֹסִיוֹ vgl. וְקָלוּ מְנַמְרִים סוֹסִיוֹ... כְּנֶשֶׁר) exklusiv סוס + קלל
Hab 1,8ab // Jer 5,6	זֶמֶר + אָזַב (sonst nur noch Jes 11,6)
Hab 1,8d // Jer 4,16	בָּאִים מֵאֲרֶץ הַמִּדְבָּר vgl. מִדְּרוֹק יָבֹא (verbindet schwach)

Dass sich dabei Habakuk auf Jeremia bezieht und nicht umgekehrt, geht aus den Unterschieden beider Texte hervor (Dialogizität): Erstens aktualisiert Hab 1,5 „in jenen Tagen“ Jer 5,18 *בְּיָמֵים הָהֵמָּה* „in euren Tagen“ Jer 5,15 u.a.; Ez 23,22; Am 6,14 Israel bzw. Jerusalem. Wörtlich decken sich dabei die einleitenden Worte in Am 6,14 und Hab 1,6 *כִּידְהֲנִי מִקֵּים*, wo die Verbindung aber im gesamten weniger stark ist als zu Jer 5,15-17.

Zweitens verzerrt und extremisiert er die Passage aus Jeremia: Hab 1,7 besingt die Chaldäer in theologisch-hymnischer Form⁽³⁶⁾ und ideologisiert ihre Gewalttätigkeit als Gerechtigkeit⁽³⁷⁾. Zuletzt bestätigt der Zielvers Hab 1,11 mit „seine Kraft ist sein Gott“ feierlich die Selbstvergötzung jener Nation. All das steht inhaltlich im Widerspruch zum implizit anzunehmenden, göttlichen Sprecher. Deshalb deute ich die intertextuelle Bezugnahme als Ironisierung⁽³⁸⁾,

⁽³⁴⁾ Die gesamte Formulierung *הָנִי* + Part. + Erhebung eines Volkes über ein anderes begegnet in den prophetischen Büchern mehrfach. Während sich Jes 13,17; Jer 49,5; Ez 25,4; 26,7 innerhalb von Völkersprüchen jeweils gegen jene Fremdvölker richten, adressieren Jer 5,15 u.a.; Ez 23,22; Am 6,14 Israel bzw. Jerusalem. Wörtlich decken sich dabei die einleitenden Worte in Am 6,14 und Hab 1,6 *כִּידְהֲנִי מִקֵּים*, wo die Verbindung aber im gesamten weniger stark ist als zu Jer 5,15-17.

⁽³⁵⁾ Zusätzliche Stichwortverbindungen bestehen durch *יָוֵם* - *תְּמָה* (Hab 1,5 // Jer 4,9), *פָּרֶשׁ* (Hab 1,8 // Jer 4,29), *מֶלֶךְ* (Hab 1,10 // Jer 4,9) und *רוּחַ* (Hab 1,11 // Jer 4,11).

⁽³⁶⁾ Der Ausdruck Hab 1,7 *הוּא נֹרָא* ist prominente JHWH-Prädikation (sonst nur Ex 34,10; Ps 96,4; 1 Chr 16,25); auch die Prädikation zweier durch *ו* verbundener Nomina mit nachgestelltem *הוּא* und *נֹרָא* (Hab 1,7) wird sonst nur für theologische Kontexte verwendet: Ex 34,6; Dtn 32,4; Ps 33,20; 86,15; 103,8; 111,4; 112,4; 115,9-11; 145,8; Joel 2,13; Jon 4,2; Neh 9,17; Sach 9,9; 2 Chr 30,9.

⁽³⁷⁾ Die Wendung *יָצָא מִשְׁפָּחָה* + *יָצָא* Hab 1,7 und *חֶסֶד* V. 9 sind die einzigen Wiederaufnahmen in VV. 6-11 aus der Klage VV. 2-4. War dort Gewalttat und Ausbleiben bzw. Verdrehen des Rechtes beklagt worden, soll nun paradoxerweise das „zur Gewalttat“ kommende Volk „sein Recht“ bringen.

⁽³⁸⁾ Schon bei K. ELLIGER, *Die Propheten: Nahum, Habakuk, Zephania, Haggai, Sacharja, Maleachi* (ATD 25; Göttingen 1967) 29-31 und W. RUDOLPH, *Micha*, 206-208, deutet sich eine Interpretation der Passage als Ironie an. Letzterer sieht hier auch den Unterschied zu Jeremia (S. 208).

wobei Hab 1,5-11 nicht als authentische, sondern als literarisch fingierte JHWH-Rede erscheint⁽³⁹⁾: Hab 1,6-11 greift mit dem Stichwort כְּשִׂיִּים jenes zentrale Thema des Jeremiabuches⁽⁴⁰⁾ auf, spielt im Folgenden mit auffälligen Formulierungen die expositionsartigen Feindbeschreibungen Jer 4,13; 5,15-17 ein und gestaltet sie in Form eines „Völkerspruches“ gegen Juda bzw. Israel und die Nachbarvölker nach jeremianischem Vorbild aus⁽⁴¹⁾. Dabei verkehrt Habakuk die jeremianische Gerichtstheologie bitter ironisch zur Antitheologie, um sich mit der provokativen Thematik der feindlichen Haltung JHWHs bei Jeremia⁽⁴²⁾ kritisch auseinanderzusetzen. Dies geschieht des weiteren auch in Hab 1,12-17 durch teilweise Bestätigung (V. 12 „JHWH, du hast sie zum Gericht eingesetzt“), aber auch klagendes Hinterfragen des Paradoxons eines gerechten Gottes, der gleichzeitig durch ungerechte Menschen bestraft (VV. 13-14).

Vor diesem Hintergrund ist Prinsloos Aufweis einer „antithetic relationship“⁽⁴³⁾ zwischen Hab 1 und 3 zu unterstreichen: Die Theophanie von Süden (3,3-15) inszeniert die geographische und strategische Komplementärbewegung gegen die von Norden her anrückenden Chaldäer (1,6-11). Während JHWH in Kap. 2 sprachlich Antwort auf die Fragen aus Kap. 1 gibt, reagiert er auf das dort angekündigte Geschehen machtvoll durch die Theophanie 3,3-15. So vollbringt er die in 1,2 erlebte Befreiung (1,2 חֲרֹשֶׁת לִישַׁע 3,14 im Gegensatz zu 1,12 לְמַשְׁפַּח 1,12) vor dem jubelnden (1,15; 3,14) und zum Fressen kommenden (1,8; 3,14, vgl. 1,13.16) Gottlosen (רָשָׁע 1,4.13; 3,13)⁽⁴⁴⁾. Während die Antitheologie von 1,5-11 depressive Klage zur Folge hat (1,12-17), führt 3,3-15 den Beter zum Jubel (3,16-19).

Auch hinsichtlich Hab 2 ist Kap. 3 als Zieltext gestaltet: Es kann als

⁽³⁹⁾ Dafür spricht zusätzlich die kommunikative Unstimmigkeit der Passage: Auf die Klage des Propheten Hab 1,2-4 hin richtet sich der nicht näher bezeichnete Sprecher an eine Adressatengruppe „in den Völkern“ (בְּגוֹיִם, vgl. PRINSLOO, „Reading“, 521-522). Der fingierten JHWH-Rede Hab 1,5-11 steht die authentische Antwort JHWHs Hab 2,2b-20 gegenüber, die mit רַעְיוֹנֵי יְהוָה וְאִמֹר 2,2a als solche eingeleitet ist, und die jener selbst durch Schriftlichkeit und Gewissheit bekräftigt (2,2b-3).

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Bei Jeremia finden sich 46 von 80 Vorkommen des Wortes כְּשִׂיִּים im Tanach. Der Name begegnet erst ab Jer 21,4, die Thematik klingt aber schon ab Jer 1,13-16 an.

⁽⁴¹⁾ B. HUWYLER, *Jeremia und die Völker*. Untersuchungen zu den Völkersprüchen in Jeremia 46–49 (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 20; Tübingen 1997), 300-304 zeigt die Ähnlichkeit zwischen den gegen Israel gerichteten „Gedichten über den ‚Feind aus dem Norden‘“ und den Völkersprüchen bei Jeremia. Er hält zudem die Umzingelung Judas durch die chaldäischen Eroberungen in umliegenden Ländern für die „Pointe der Völkersprüche“ (ebd. 323).

⁽⁴²⁾ HUWYLER, *Jeremia* 278-285, 284 spricht von einer „starke[n], in fast allen Gedichten und Sprüchen nachweisbare[n], beinahe pedantisch wirkende[n] Betonung, daß JHWH der eigentliche Feind ist, der gegen die Völker Krieg führt“.

⁽⁴³⁾ PRINSLOO, „Reading“, 528.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Zum Problem der Identität des רָשָׁע bei Hab vgl. G.T.M. PRINSLOO, „Die identifikasie van die goddelose in Habakuk: ‘n literêre benadering“, *Tydskrif vir Semitiesiek/Journal for Semitics* 1 (1989) 88-107: Die Rede vom Gottlosen hat in erster Linie theologisch-thematische Relevanz für das Gesamtbuch, seine Identität ist schillernd. Schon in Hab 1,4 kann sowohl v.a. (aufgrund der Stichworte חֲרֹשֶׁת, מַשְׁפַּח) die innerjüdische Gottlosigkeit gemeint sein, gleichzeitig aber die der Chaldäer, insofern sie erstere mitprovozieren, indem sie den Gerechten „einkreisen“ (כָּתַר, vgl. PRINSLOO, „Reading“, 522: „It is the Chaldeans who cause the breakdown in social justice complained about in 1:2-4“). Die Stichwortverbindungen von Hab 3,14 zu 1,8.15-16 lassen schließen, dass hier in erster Linie der Feind von außen gemeint ist (gegen HUWYLER, „Habakuk“, 256).

existentielle Realisierung der Gottesantwort 2,2-20 gelesen werden (s. unten), die 2,14 als Prolepse einlöst⁽⁴⁵⁾ und auf die dramaturgische Vorbereitung von 2,20 folgt.

Die finalisierende Funktion von Hab 3 wird schließlich vom theologischen Skopus des Habakukbuches her deutlich. Dessen zentrale Fragestellung einer theologischen Verhältnisbestimmung von intranationalem (innerhalb Juda/Israel) und internationalem Unrecht (von Seiten der Chaldäer) findet im Gesamtkonzept dialogisch-dramatische Inszenierung⁽⁴⁶⁾: Auf die erste Klage des Propheten über von Gott unbeantwortetes intranationales Unrecht (1,2-4) folgt die bitter ironische Verzerrung einer Theologie kollektiven, internationalen Gerichtes durch die Chaldäer (1,5-11). Gegen das darin enthaltene Paradoxon, ein kriegsverbrecherisch (1,15.17) und blasphemisch (1,16) handelndes Volk könne Werkzeug des gerechten Gottes sein, wendet sich die insistierende zweite Klage des Propheten (1,12-17). JHWHs Antwort 2,2-20 zielt auf eine radikal individualisierte Gerechtigkeitstheologie (2,4-5): Leben realisiere sich für den je Gerechten, Misslingen für den je Unaufrichtigen. Die im folgenden zitierten Wehe-Worte (2,6-20) falten dieses Prinzip aus, indem sie Motive intra- und internationalen Unrechts kombinieren⁽⁴⁷⁾ und kollektiv verurteilen. Im prophetischen Gebet Habakuks erfahren beide Aspekte der Gerechtigkeit ihre Synthese: Durch Vernichtung des verbrecherischen Angreifers zur Rettung des Volkes auf internationaler Ebene verwirklicht Gott für den paradigmatischen Einzelnen, den prophetischen Beter, Rettung und Freude.

In seiner historischen Verortung erscheint Habakuk weder als Vorgänger⁽⁴⁸⁾, noch als gleichgesinnter Zeitgenosse⁽⁴⁹⁾, sondern als kritischer Nachfolger von Jeremia. Er ist nicht als theologisch minderwertiger Kultprophet zu disqualifizieren⁽⁵⁰⁾, sondern von seinem impliziten historischen Hintergrund her zu deuten und zu werten: In der Situation aufgrund akuter Feindbedrohung völlig zerstörter sozialer Identität⁽⁵¹⁾ schafft Habakuk einen schriftgelehrten, poetisch kreativen und beeindruckend starken Text, um Hoffnung zu stiften.

*
* *

⁽⁴⁵⁾ Der die Theophanie einleitende Vers Hab 3,3 nimmt wesentliche Motive von 2,14 in invertierter Reihenfolge wieder auf: Wurzel שמים, כסה vgl. klanglich כמים, חדרו vgl. ארץ + מלא, דעת, vgl. חדלה, כבוד ידוה

⁽⁴⁶⁾ HUWYLER, "Habakuk", 250 spricht von "prophetischer Inszenierung".

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Diese Deutungsmöglichkeit legt sich durch die jeweilige Dynamik der Wehe-Worte von einer eng fokussierenden, personalen Motivik (VV. 6-7.9.12.15-16.18-19) hin zu sehr weitem (internationalisierendem bzw. universalisierendem) Fokus (VV. 8.10.13-14.17.20) nahe. E. ORTO, "Die Theologie des Habakukbuches", VT 35 (1985) 274-295, bes. 283, deutet diesen Befund diachron und wertet "Hab. ii 5bß, 6a, 8, 10bα, 13, 14, 17" als Teil einer "antibabylonischen Uminterpretation".

⁽⁴⁸⁾ JEREMIAS, *Kultprophetie und Gerichtsverkündigung in der späten Königszeit Israels* (Neukirchen 1970) 89, vgl. HUWYLER, "Habakuk", 249, n. 58.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ HUWYLER, "Habakuk", 253.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ In diese Richtung geht JEREMIAS, *Kultprophetie*, 199.

⁽⁵¹⁾ Vgl. v.a. Hab 1,14-17; 3,14. Auch wird der Identitätsverlust im völligen Fehlen eines Eigennamens für das bedrängte Gottesvolk bei Habakuk sichtbar, was für die prophetischen Bücher einmalig ist.

Dieser Beitrag möchte anregen, die intertextuelle Untersuchung von Habakuk weiterzuverfolgen. Verweist etwa auch die Formulierung "schreibe auf die Tafeln" (2,2) eines als schriftgelehrten Propheten verstandenen Habakuk auf die Mosegestalt⁽⁵²⁾? Könnte der literarische Einfluss von Jer 4–5 in Hab 3 noch spürbar sein⁽⁵³⁾? Besonders das Verhältnis dieses Kapitels zu Ps 44; 77 sowie von V. 11 zu Jos 10,13⁽⁵⁴⁾ verdienen eingehendere Bearbeitung. Damit sich in der Auslegungsgeschichte des Habakukbuches weiterhin spiegle, was dieser Text selbst propagiert: dialogisches Ringen um theologische Wahrheit.

Im Anger 198
A-6073 Sistrans

Dominik MARKL

SUMMARY

The investigation of intentional intertextual references carried out in this article is based on the criteria introduced by the Anglicist Manfred Pfister. I arrive at the conclusion that Hab 3 refers to preceding biblical texts: In vv. 3.19 the prophetic prayer alludes to Deut 33 and 2 Sam 22 in order to assume the function of authoritative vicarious prayer, while avoiding martial ideology. If one approaches the book as a whole, Hab 3 stands in antithetical relationship to Hab 1, especially due to the fact that the theophany constitutes a counterattack against the Chaldean offensive described in Hab 1,5-11. This latter text seems to be given the form of a bitter ironical parody of Jer 5,15-17.

⁽⁵²⁾ Die Wendung mit Artikel על־הַלֵּחַ (וְיָ) כְּתָב + begegnet sonst nur in Ex 34,1.28; Dtn 10,2.4; vgl. aber auch Jes 30,8; Jer 17,1; (Spr 3,3; 7,3).

⁽⁵³⁾ Nur Hab 3,17 und Jer 5,17 kombinieren die Motive נָפַח, תְּהוֹמָה, שָׁאֵן und בָּקָר (vgl. AVISHUR, *Studies*, 197-198).

⁽⁵⁴⁾ AVISHUR, *Studies*, 138-139.

“Ich bin ein Knecht des Herrn”. Bemerkungen zur LXX- Übersetzung des Wortes עברי in Jon 1,9

Eine Überfahrt von Jafo nach Tarschisch. Ebenso verzweifelt wie vergeblich mühen sich die Matrosen, sich selbst und ihr Schiff zu retten. Auf ihre Frage, welchen Beruf Jona ausübt, woher er kommt, aus welchem Land er stammt und zu welchem Volk er gehört, antwortet der Prophet mit einem Satz, der eigentlich die Frage der Seeleute nicht vollständig beantwortet. “Ich bin ein Hebräer” sagt er. Wie es in der hebräischen Narrative üblich ist — könnte man meinen — wird die zuletzt gestellte Frage als erste beantwortet⁽¹⁾.

Die Bedeutung des Wortes עברי als Bezeichnung einer ethnischen Gruppe ist weit verbreitet und dies nicht nur im Alten Testament sondern auch in der nachalttestamentlichen Literatur⁽²⁾. Die anderen drei Fragen der Matrose nach Beruf, Herkunftsort und Land jedoch bleiben — auf Grund der Reaktion der Seeleute, die sich fürchten und wiederum mit einer Frage drängen — ohne Antwort.

Die aus der Liturgie entlehnte⁽³⁾ Aussage Jonas aber beinhaltet eine tiefe theologische Dimension⁽⁴⁾ und schafft, indem sie sich des Wortes עברי bedient, eine ganze Fülle an zusätzlichen Problemen⁽⁵⁾. Vor dem Hintergrund, dass Jona ein עברי ist, begreifen die Seeleute die ganze Tragweite seiner Antwort und sind auf Grund dieser Antwort bereit gläubige Israeliten zu werden: Sie fürchten JHWH⁽⁶⁾, bringen ein Schlachtopfer dar — wiewohl dies auf einem Schiff nahezu unmöglich sein dürfte — und legen Gelübde ab.

*
* *

(¹) Ein gelungenes Beispiel von hysteron-proteron.

(²) Dazu seien die folgenden Werke genannt: M. WEIPPERT, *Die Landnahme der israelitischen Stämme in der neueren wissenschaftlichen Diskussion* (FRLANT 92; Göttingen 1967) 66-102; L. BAECK, “Der Ibri”, *Monatszeitschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 83 (1939) 66-80; K. KOCH, “Die Hebräer vom Auszug aus Ägypten bis zum Großreich Davids”, *VT* 19 (1969) 43-44 sowie von G. HARVEY, *The True Israel. Uses of the names Jew, Hebrew and Israel in ancient Jewish and early Christian literature* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 35; Leiden 1996) und O. LORETZ, *Habiru - Hebräer. Eine sozio-linguistische Studie über der Herkunft des Gentiliziums ‘ibri vom Appellativum habiru* (BZAW 160; Berlin – New York 1984).

(³) C.A. KELLER, *Jonas* (CAT 11a; Neuchâtel 1965).

(⁴) Selbst ohne nähere Erklärungen stellt Jonas Antwort die Seeleute zufrieden und bewirkt in ihnen den Glauben an JHWH. S. BEN CHORIN, *Die Antwort des Jonas. Zum Gestaltwandel Israels* (Hamburg 1956) 14, bezeichnet die Aussage “עברי אנכי” als “das jüdische Urbekenntnis”, und zwar sowohl im Sinne des Selbstbewusstseins als auch als öffentliches Grundbekenntnis.

(⁵) Siehe auch S. SCHREINER, “Das Buch Jona – ein kritisches Resümee der Geschichte Israels”, *Theologische Versuche* 9 (1977) 37-39.

(⁶) Im Unterschied zu v. 5, wo jeder Matrose sich an seinen eigenen אלהים wendet.

עברי⁽⁷⁾ werden die Israeliten nur von Ausländern genannt bzw. stellen sich — handelt es sich um eine Selbstbezeichnung — gegenüber Angehörigen anderer Völker auf diese Weise vor⁽⁸⁾. עברי wird im gesamten Alten Testament nur auf Israeliten bezogen; es ist eine Bezeichnung, die — nach ihrem ersten Vorkommen in Gen 14,13 — im Genesisbuch ausschließlich den Nachkommen Abrams zusteht.

Im Buch Exodus dann unterscheidet sich das Volk Gottes mittels dieser Bezeichnung von den Ägyptern. Die Autorität, welche Mose Pharao gegenüberstellt, wird als יהוה אלדי העברים bezeichnet⁽⁹⁾.

In Jeremiabuch finden sich die — innerhalb der großen Propheten — einzigen zwei Nachweise von עברי. Die Bestimmung aus Dtn 15 zur Freilassung der hebräischen Sklaven werden hier sehr wahrscheinlich wieder aufgenommen⁽¹⁰⁾.

Die Belege in 1Sam zeigen, dass עברי immer in Zusammenhang mit ישראל⁽¹¹⁾ gebraucht wird und dass somit, wie schon im Buch Genesis, die Nachkommenschaft Abrahams bezeichnet wird. Alle diese Stellen stehen in Zusammenhang mit den Kämpfen gegen die Philister. Mit Ausnahme von Jona 1,9 wird sonst die Bezeichnung עברי nicht mehr in einer ethnischen Bedeutung gebraucht.

Formal gesehen entspricht die Selbstbezeichnung Jonas als עברי genau dem in den übrigen alttestamentlichen Texten üblichen Gebrauch des Wortes: Vor einer Gruppe ausländischer Matrosen, die JHWH nicht einmal kennen, gibt sich Jona als עברי aus. Der Erzähler der Jonageschichte verwendet עברי⁽¹¹⁾ und möchte somit zunächst auf die Frage nach der Volkszugehörigkeit Jonas antworten.

Die Probleme, welche die Verwendung dieser Bezeichnung aufwirft, sind jedoch nicht so leicht zu lösen, wie es auf den ersten Blick scheinen mag. עברי beinhaltet unterschiedliche Bedeutungsschattierungen und macht so eine Vielzahl von Deutungen möglich. Vor allem aber liefert die LXX-Übersetzung von Jon 1,9 einen beachtlichen Hinweis zum — meines Erachtens richtigen — Verständnis der Selbstbezeichnung Jonas.

*
* *

(7) Für eine spezifische philologische Erklärung des Begriffes siehe L. KOEHLER – W. BAUMGARTNER, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament* (Leiden 1983) III, 739-740.

(8) Gen 40,15; 41,12; 43,32; Ex 1,15.16.19; 2,6.7.11.13; 3,18; 5,3; 7,16; 9,1; Dtn 15,12; 1 Sam 4,6.9 u. a.

(9) In unterschiedlichen Formen kommt diese Wendung in Ex 3,18; 5,3; 7,16; 9,1.13; 10,3 vor.

(10) Gegen eine solche Annahme sprechen sich vor allem I. CARDELLINI, *Die biblischen "Sklaven"-Gesetze im Lichte des keilschriftlichen Sklavenrechts*. Ein Beitrag zur Tradition, Überlieferung und Redaktion der alttestamentlichen Rechtstexte (BBB 55; Bonn 1981) 312-333, und H. WEIPPERT, *Die Prosareden des Jeremiabuches* (BZAW 132; Berlin 1973) 86-106, aus.

(11) Für die Bedeutungsunterschiede zwischen Hebräer, Jude und Israelit siehe J.M. SASSON, *Jonah. A New translation with introduction, commentary and interpretation* (AB 24; New York 1990) 115-116.

34mal kommt עברי im masoretischen Text vor⁽¹²⁾. Die LXX gibt dieses Wort 28mal mit Ἑβραῖος, “Hebräer” wieder — je nach Zusammenhang maskulin oder feminin, Singular oder Plural, als Eigenschaftswort oder als Substantiv. Sechsmal bietet der griechische Text jedoch eine andere Variante für die Übersetzung von עברי an. Zweimal ist die Übersetzung mit οἱ δοῦλοι auf die Verwechslung zwischen Resch und Dalet zurückzuführen⁽¹³⁾: Der Übersetzer hat statt עברי offenbar עברי gelesen und dem entsprechend übertragen⁽¹⁴⁾.

In Gen 14,13 gibt die LXX den hebräischen Text לאברי העברי mit Ἀβραμ τῷ περάτῃ, “Abram dem Wanderer, dem Emigranten, dem Grenzen Überschreitenden” wieder. Hier haben die Autoren der LXX — vielleicht bewusst⁽¹⁵⁾ — einen etymologischen Versuch unternommen, die Ableitung des zum ersten Mal vorkommenden Wortes עברי auf das Verb עבר, “überschreiten, durchschreiten, vorübergehen” zurückzuführen. Diese Ableitung findet ihre Berechtigung nicht so sehr in der Morphologie, sondern viel mehr in den biographischen Notizen über das Leben Abrams, der sowohl ein Hirtenleben geführt hat als auch mehrmals von einem Land zum anderen wandern hat müssen⁽¹⁶⁾.

An zwei anderen Stellen kann ein ähnliches Vorgehen wahrgenommen werden: So in 1 Sam 29,3, wo עבריים mit τῖνες οἱ διαπορευόμενοι οὗτοι übersetzt wird. Nur die masoretische Vokalisierung und der Artikel unterscheiden das עבריים in v. 3 vom zweimal in v. 2 vorkommenden עבריים, ein Qal Partizip im status absolutus von עבר. Es ist sehr wahrscheinlich, dass die Übersetzer die zwei im Masoretentext unterschiedlich vokalisiert Wörter verwechselt haben. Nachdem sie in v. 2 das Verb παραπορεύομαι zweimal verwendet hatten, tauschten sie nun das Prefix παρὰ zu διὰ aus und behielten die Wurzel πορεύω, die im näheren Kontext schon vorgekommen war, bei.

In 1 Sam 13,7 geschieht genau dasselbe. Die LXX erkennt den Unterschied zwischen ועבריים und עברי nicht und übersetzt beide Male mit διαβαίνω. Die עבריים werden somit zu διαβαίνοντες, zu welchen, die den Jordan überschreiten.

In Jon 1,9 wird der Nominalsatz עברי אֲנִי mit δοῦλος κυρίου ἐγὼ εἰμι wiedergegeben. Sicherlich bietet sich die Möglichkeit einer Variation der עברי / עברי Verwechslung auch für Jon 1,9 an⁽¹⁷⁾. Die Tatsache, dass der

⁽¹²⁾ Gen 14,1; 39,14.17; 40,15; 41,12; 43,32; Ex 1,15.16.19; 2,6.7.11.13; 3,18; 5,3; 7,16; 9,1.13; 10,3; 21,2; Dtn 15,12 (2x); 1 Sam 4,6.9; 13,3.7.19; 14,11.21; 29,3; Jer 34,9 (2x).14; Jon 1,9.

⁽¹³⁾ Zum Phänomen der Reschzisierung siehe M. HARL, “Les divergences entre la Septante et le texte massorétique”, *La Bible grecque des Septantes* (Hrsg. M. HARL – G. DORIVAL – O. MUNNICH) (Paris 1988) 206.

⁽¹⁴⁾ 1 Sam 13,3; 14,21.

⁽¹⁵⁾ D.N. FREEDMAN – B.E. WILLOUGHBY, עברי, *THAT V*, 1056.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Vor Gen 14,13 ist Abram bereits aus Haran nach Kanaan, von Sichem nach Ägypten, von dort in den Negeb und dann nach Hebron gezogen.

⁽¹⁷⁾ So z. B. FREEDMAN – WILLOUGHBY, עברי, 1055-1056; J.A. BEWER, *Haggai, Malachi, Jonah [Zachariah]* (ICC; Edinburgh 1980) 37; J. LUST – E. EYNIKEL – K. HAUSPIE, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Stuttgart 1992) I, 120b und auch S. P. CARBONE – G. RIZZI, *Aggeo, Gioele, Giona, Malachia. Secondo il testo ebraico masoretico, secondo la versione della LXX, secondo la parafrasi aramaica targumica* (Bologna 2001) 240. Carbone und Rizzi betonen die leichte Ironie, die hinter einer solchen Übersetzung steckt, da sich Jona im Moment seiner Aussage nicht wirklich als ein Knecht Gottes erwiesen hat.

Übersetzer κυρίως ergänzen muss⁽¹⁸⁾ — um dem Satz zu vervollständigen und um aufzulösen, wem der Dienst Jonas gelten soll⁽¹⁹⁾ — belastet die These der Verwechslung jedoch beträchtlich.

Die Annahme, die Wendung “Diener des Herrn” habe zur Zeit der Verfassung des Jonabuches eine große Rolle gespielt und daher den Übersetzer beeinflusst⁽²⁰⁾, scheint mir ein nur wenig befriedigender Versuch zu sein, ein – doch relevantes – Problem auf eine einfache und bequeme Weise zu lösen⁽²¹⁾.

Der Gelehrte, welcher das Jonabuch ins Griechische übertragen hat, wäre sicherlich imstande gewesen, den hebräischen Text buchstabengetreu zu übersetzen. Er beweist dies unter anderem, indem er Hebraismen, die den Stil im Griechischen nicht gerade verschönern, problemlos wiedergibt⁽²²⁾. Ihm daher einen so billigen Fehler unterstellen zu wollen, wäre unmotiviert und berücksichtigt in keiner Weise eine eventuelle lexikalische bzw. theologische Überlegung, welche im Hintergrund der Übersetzung gestanden haben mag.

Auf einer rein inhaltlichen Ebene beantwortet die Aussage Jonas in der LXX-Version die Frage der Matrosen noch weniger als in der hebräischen Version: Die narrative Ordnung wird nicht respektiert, die Antwort geht auf keine der vier Fragen der Seeleute ein. Die LXX-Version wäre in diesem Fall weder eine Vereinfachung oder Nivellierung des Hebräischen noch eine hinzugefügte Glosse⁽²³⁾.

*
* *

Die Bezeichnung Jonas als Knecht Gottes ist im Alten Testament nichts Neues. Da die Formel יְהוָה בִּלְחָמִי (Jona 1,1) nur noch in 2Kön 14,25 vorkommt, ist anzunehmen, dass der Verfasser des Jonabuches seinen Protagonisten von dort ausgeliehen hat. Mühelos stellt der gelehrte Leser die entsprechende Verbindung her, umso mehr dürfte dem gebildeten Übersetzer des hebräischen Textes bekannt gewesen sein, dass Jona dort als δούλος αὐτοῦ (Gottes) näher bestimmt wird⁽²⁴⁾: Dieser intertextuelle Bezug könnte

⁽¹⁸⁾ Es ist dies im Jonabuch der einzige Fall, wo — entgegen dem hebräischen Text — κύριος hinzugefügt wird.

⁽¹⁹⁾ U. SIMON, *Jona*. Ein jüdischer Kommentar (SBS 157; Stuttgart 1994) 86 bezeichnet diese Annahme als “wahrscheinlich”. Dabei wäre das y als Abkürzung des Gottesnamens – wie z. B. in LXXJer 6,11 – zu verstehen. So auch J.A. BEWER, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jonah* (ICC 19; Edinburgh 1961) 37-38. Für andere Beispiele einer solchen Übersetzung siehe J. DELCOR, “Des diverses Manières d’écrire le tétragramme sacré dans les anciens documents hébraïques”, *Études bibliques et orientales de religions comparées* (Hrsg. J. DELCOR) (Leiden 1979) 1-29.

⁽²⁰⁾ FREEDMAN – WILLOUGHBY, עֲבָרִי, 1056.

⁽²¹⁾ So darf man auch nicht eine — heute nicht mehr erhaltene — originale hebräische Vorlage für den griechischen Text postulieren, wie dies z.B. J.M. SASSON, *Jonah*, 116 tut.

⁽²²⁾ Z. B. LXXJon 1,10; 3,6; 4,2.8.10. Für die häufigsten Hebraismen siehe C. DOGNIEZ – L. BROTTIER – M. CASEVITZ – P. SANDEVOIR, *Joël, Abdiou, Naoum, Ambakoum, Sophonie* (La Bible d’Alexandrie 23. Les douze prophètes 4-9; Paris 1999) 121. Hilfreich und übersichtlich ist diesbezüglich auch CARBONE – RIZZI, *Giona*, 230-244.

⁽²³⁾ CARBONE – RIZZI, *Giona*, 240.

⁽²⁴⁾ Diese Meinung wird von HARL, *Jonas*, 144 und SASSON, *Jonah*, 116 vertreten und bei SIMON, *Jona*, 86 erwähnt.

zumindest erklären, woher der Übersetzer die Bezeichnung δοῦλος κυρίου abgeleitet hat, ohne dass man ihm eine Fehllesung unterstellen muss.

Davon abgesehen, kann man an der zu diskutierenden Stelle jedoch eine interpretative Übersetzung erkennen, was im Jonabuch immer wieder vorkommt⁽²⁵⁾. Der Übersetzer hätte damit — wie es zumindest seiner Wahrnehmung entsprochen haben mag — den eigentlichen bzw. tieferen Sinn des hebräischen Terminus wiedergegeben: Trotz seines Versuches, sich dagegen zu wehren, ist Jona von Anfang an ein Dienstmann JHWHs⁽²⁶⁾.

*
* * *

Denn Jona weiß weit mehr, als der Erzähler ausdrücklich darstellt. So wird erst in Jon 4,2 deutlich, dass dem Propheten das — von ihm als tragisch wahrgenommene — Ende seiner Gerichtspredigt schon im vorhinein bewusst gewesen ist. Der LXX-Übersetzer legt Jona eine Aussage in den Mund, die diesen — obwohl er erst am Anfang seiner erfolglosen Flucht steht — als unwiderruflichen Knecht Gottes bezeichnet und damit den Schluss der Geschichte vorwegnimmt. Ob Jona selbst mit dem Auftrag Gottes einverstanden ist oder nicht, ob er sich bemüht, diesen zu erfüllen oder nicht, er bleibt ein Knecht desjenigen Gottes, der das Meer und das Trockene gemacht hat.

Darin spiegelt sich das Tragische der menschlichen Erfahrung Jonas. Bis ans Ende versucht er vergeblich sich zu widersetzen. Er wird bei Ninive aus dem Rachen des Fisches gespien und muss dort predigen. Er tut es — obwohl Ninive drei Tagesmärsche groß ist — nur einen Tag lang und wartet dann, dass über Ninive die gerechte Strafe kommt. Wie er feststellt, dass dies nicht eintrifft, protestiert er verärgert, doch im Bewusstsein, gegen den Gott, dessen Knecht er unabänderlich ist, ohnedies nichts unternehmen zu können.

Das Ende des Buches bleibt offen, und der Leser erfährt nicht, wie es Jona nach der abschließenden — wohl rhetorischen — Frage Gottes ergehen wird. Seine letzten Worte in 4,9 bringen jedoch noch einmal seinen Zorn zum Ausdruck, für eine verständnisvolle, ja gar zustimmende Haltung seinerseits fehlt jedes Indiz. Er verharrt in seiner Wut gegen JHWH wie gegen sich selbst, da er schon von Anfang an gewusst hat, er kann nur ein δοῦλος κυρίου bleiben.

Universität Wien
Institut für Alttestamentliche Bibelwissenschaft
Schottenring 21
1010 Vienna

Simone PAGANINI

⁽²⁵⁾ CARBONE – RIZZI, *Giona*, 238.

⁽²⁶⁾ SCHREINER, *Jona*, 39. Ähnlich auch D. DEDEN, *De Kleine Profeten: Jonas* (De Boeken van het Oude Testament 12; Roermond 1953) 189.

SUMMARY

La frase pronunciata da Giona alla domanda dei marinai in 1,9 sembra voler rispondere all'ultimo quesito da loro posto: a quale popolo lui appartenga. Giona risponde con עברי אנכי e usa la designazione tipica per un israelita che si trova a discutere con persone non appartenenti al suo popolo. La traduzione della LXX, δοῦλος κυρίου ἐγὼ εἰμι, fa però nascere un problema che non è risolvibile unicamente con il presupporre uno scambio tra ר e ד. עברי viene tradotto altre volte con termini diversi da ἑβραῖος ma in Gio 1,9 il traduttore aggiunge di suo il termine κυρίου. Ci troviamo di fronte ad una traduzione interpretativa, fondata su un'idea teologica del libro di Giona secondo la quale, sin dall'inizio gli è chiara la sua missione, il suo esito e anche la sua realtà: lui è un servo di JHWH.

“Tarshish Has Perished”: The Crux of Isaiah 23,10

Isaiah’s oracle concerning Tyre (Isa 23,1-14) is generally recognized as a text with more than its share of interpretational difficulties. Perhaps the most problematic line in this problematic poem is v. 10. A straightforward translation of the MT would be: “Cross over to your land like the Nile, O Daughter (of?) Tarshish, (the) belt is no more”. Crossing over “like the Nile” makes no sense, nor does “(the) belt is no more”. There can be little doubt that some corruption has occurred in this verse.

Any plausible solution to the problems of this line has to “work” in all of the following three areas. First, any emendations to the text should be plausible in terms of Biblical Hebrew *grammar and lexicography*. The resulting line should make good sense in itself. Second, the emended reading should be recognizable as good Biblical Hebrew *poetry* (a requirement frequently ignored in proposed emendations of Hebrew poetic texts!). Third, the resulting reading should fit well into the *context* of this poem. It is incumbent on the one proposing any emendations to the text to show that they fit these requirements.

For the purpose of establishing the earlier reading of this verse the most important textual witness is the LXX: ἐργάζου τὴν γῆν σου, καὶ γὰρ πλοῖα οὐκέτι ἔρχεται ἐκ Καρχηδόνας. P.W. Flint, in the most thorough and perceptive treatment of the LXX of this passage to date, translates: “Till your land, for no longer do ships come forth from Carthage⁽¹⁾ [= Tarshish]”⁽²⁾. According to Flint, this is a very free rendering⁽³⁾ of the *Vorlage*: עֲבֹד אֶרֶץ כִּי לֹא־בָרַח תִּרְשִׁישׁ אֵין מַחֲזֵר which he translates: “Till your land, for the boats of Tarshish no longer have a harbour”⁽⁴⁾. Literally, of course, עֲבֹד . . . is “because for the boats of Tarshish there is no longer a harbor”. The translation understands Tarshish’s situation to be so desperate that she might as well forget her lucrative trading activities on the high seas (as part of the Tyrian-Sidonian trading empire) and turn to farming.

I judge Flint’s restoration of the *Vorlage* to be essentially correct and an important step toward recovering a more original Hebrew text. I say this because with one exception *every letter* in his proposed *Vorlage* corresponds to a letter in the MT or one of the Dead Sea Isaiah manuscripts and the letters are in the same sequence except in one case (מֶחֶז for the MT’s מֶחֶז).

The only quibble I have is the letter ל. I would eliminate this preposition before אֶרֶץ because it is unsupported by any of the early Hebrew manuscripts from Qumran or the MT. Moreover, the preposition ל is not really necessary

(1) P.W. FLINT, “The Septuagint Version of Isaiah 23:1-14 and the Massoretic Text”, *Bulletin of the International Organization for LXX and Cognate Studies* 21 (1988) 48, n. 57. I am indebted to J.S. Kselman for bringing this article to my attention.

(2) In vv. 1, 6, and 10 the LXX translates תִּרְשִׁישׁ as Καρχηδόνα.

(3) FLINT, “The Septuagint Version of Isaiah 23:1-14”, 39.

(4) Ibid., and 48, n. 57.

to arrive at the translation he proposes. It is plausible that the LXX translator had before him אֲרֵבָה תַּרְשִׁישִׁי, which he interpreted as a *casus pendens* or nominative absolute⁽⁵⁾ — perhaps because he did not know what else to make of it — taking the line to mean: “for as regards the boats of Tarshish there is no longer a harbor”.

The *Vorlage* restored by Flint, with its reading of מָחוֹ, i.e., מָחוֹ, “harbor”, for the MT’s מָחוֹ eliminates the only problem in the latter part of our passage. The only plausible translation of the *hapax legomenon* מָחוֹ is “belt, sash”, taking it as a loanword from Akkadian *mēhe/azu*⁽⁶⁾. But this clearly does not fit the context⁽⁷⁾. The proposal to assume that a metathesis occurred here at some point and the word was earlier מָחוֹ was made over a century ago by B. Duhm⁽⁸⁾ and has been adopted by many if not the majority of commentators since then. As we shall see presently, his emendation — and this part of the LXX *Vorlage* — is absolutely correct.

The most important part of Flint’s restoration, I submit, is his reading אֲרֵבָה, which he takes to be אֲרֵבָה, a plural form, the name of a type of boat attested in rabbinic Hebrew/Aramaic and which may occur in Isa 25,11 (a difficult passage). This is an inspired suggestion, since it requires no changes to the lettering of the MT and is eminently plausible as the term underlying *πλοῖα*. It seems that the Hebrew word denotes some kind of small boat⁽⁹⁾. Flint notes that in modern Hebrew it is the name of a type of flat-bottomed vessel⁽¹⁰⁾. If this is correct, the LXX *Vorlage* does not present a pristine reading here, since the large sea-going merchant vessels of Phoenician trade, elsewhere in this poem called אֲנִיֹּת תַּרְשִׁישִׁי, “Tarshish ships” (vv. 1, 14, and so in the rest of the OT), were certainly not small or flat-bottomed boats, which are completely unsuited for sailing on the high seas.

Still, the LXX *Vorlage* does take us back to a pre-Masoretic stage of this text. In particular, אֲרֵבָה תַּרְשִׁישִׁי is a more accurate division of words than the MT’s אֲרֵבָה בֵּת תַּרְשִׁישִׁי. It is not the original reading, but at this point only two textual errors separate us from what I would claim to be the original text of this verse, and both occur in the word אֲרֵבָה. The first of these is another metathesis: אֲרֵבָה. The second is the common confusion of *dalet* and *resh*. The word earlier read אֲרֵבָה, to be pointed אֲרֵבָה — an archaic 3d fem. sg. Qal⁽¹¹⁾.

(5) On this construction, see B.K. WALTKE – M. O’CONNOR, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN 1990) §4.7a-c.

(6) *AHW*, 650; *CAD M/2*, 46. W.L. HOLLADAY (*A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* [Grand Rapids, MI 1988] 189) gives the meaning “wharf” as does (apparently) O. KAISER (*Isaiah 13-39. A Commentary* [OTL; Philadelphia 1974] 161), but neither provides evidence for such a translation.

(7) A. VAN DER KOOIJ defends the reading מָחוֹ but I do not find his argument convincing (*The Oracle of Tyre. The Septuagint of Isaiah XXIII as Version and Vision* [VTS 71; Leiden 1998] 139).

(8) B. DUHM, *Das Buch Jesaja* (HKAT; Göttingen 1892) 169. The term in question is attested otherwise in the Hebrew Bible only in Ps 107,30. In proposing this emendation Duhm did not refer to the reading of the LXX or to its putative *Vorlage*.

(9) J. LEVY, *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim* (Berlin 1924) I, 157 defines this vessel as a “Skiff [or] Kahn,” which designates some kind of rowboat or river barge.

(10) “The Septuagint Version of Isaiah 23:1-14”, 42, n. 39.

(11) See GKC §44f. Theoretically one might go further here and suggest another emendation in this word. Since ך and ך were at times confused in the script (see F.

The three words in v. 10 are to be read: **כִּי אֶבְדָּה תַרְשִׁישׁ**. Thus I propose that the "original text"⁽¹²⁾ of v. 10 was:

עברי ארצך כי אבדה תרשיש // אין מחו עור

Cross (back) to your⁽¹³⁾ own land, for Tarshish has perished,
(for) the harbor/port city⁽¹⁴⁾ is no more.

Does such a reading reflect the conventions of good Biblical Hebrew poetry? It does, because the restored bicolon is based on an attested word-pair, (**עור** // **אבר** // **אין**). This pair occurs 9x in the MT⁽¹⁵⁾ and also in CD 5,17; 9,14-15. By way of illustration I cite one biblical example:

האין עור חכמה בתימן // אבדה עצה מבנים

Is there no wisdom in Teman anymore?

has counsel perished from the wise? (Jer 49,7)

Finally, as I mentioned above, the proposed reading must fit well with the overall context of the passage itself. Does a reference to the destruction of Tarshish "fit" in this poem, and specifically at this particular juncture?

First we shall consider the *immediate context* of v. 10. (1) The reading of v. 10 argued here is on the mark *thematically*. The theological center and the real message of Isa 23,1-14 is found in vv. 9 and 11, which in characteristic Isaian fashion speak of Yahweh's intention to humble the "proud"⁽¹⁶⁾ — in this case by destroying the ports⁽¹⁷⁾ of the Tyrian-Sidonian maritime empire.

DELITZSCH, *Die Lese- und Schreibfehler im Alten Testament* [Berlin – Leipzig 1920] §105a), it is possible that the proposed **אבדה** resulted from an earlier **אברה**, the standard form of the 3d fem. sg. Qal. But prudence cautions against multiplying emendations, especially within a single word, though there are instances in which more than two errors in a single word can be demonstrated.

(¹²) I am aware of at least some of the current discussion surrounding the term "the original text", that the very existence of such a thing is controverted and that the term means different things to different authors. Therefore for this paper I take for the definition of "the original text" one of the *possible meanings* given by E. Ulrich: "[The original text is the text] as reconstructed from the extant testimony insofar as possible but with the most plausible conjectural emendations when it is generally agreed that no extant witness preserves a sound reading" (*The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* [Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, MI 1999] 13).

(¹³) The subject of the imperative **עברי** and of all the other feminine imperatives in this poem (vv. 4 [בוש], 6 [עברי], 12 [קמי עברי]) is Sidon.

(¹⁴) In the ancient Near East many terms for "harbor" also meant "harbor district" and from this "port of trade." **מחו** has this meaning in post-biblical Hebrew (see M. JASTROW, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* [New York 1967] 757: "harbor, trading place"). Its Ugaritic cognate *ma/iḥd* = /ma(ʿ)ḥādu/ is occasionally written in Akkadian as URU.ma-a-ḥa-di, where the determinative URU denotes a city-name (see G. DEL OLMO LETE – J. SANMARTÍN, *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition* [trans. W.G.E. Watson; Leiden 2003] 513). Cf. also Akkadian *kāru*, "harbor, harbor district, city quarter destined for traders and sailors" (see CAD K, 231).

(¹⁵) Deut 32,28; Job 31,19; Ps 142,5; Qoh 9,6; Isa 41,11; Jer 49,7; Mic 4,9; 7,2; Zeph 2,5.

(¹⁶) In v. 9 **נאין**, "pride", is parallel to **כבדי**, "nobles (of the earth)", and thus may be translated concretely in this context as "the proud". For this "abstract // concrete" construction, see W.G.E. WATSON, *Classical Hebrew Poetry. A Guide to Its Techniques* (JSOTSS 26; Sheffield 1984) §11.10 (pp. 314-316).

(¹⁷) Although many translate **מחו** in this poem (vv. 4, 11, 14) as "stronghold", strictly speaking this is not correct. This word is unrelated etymologically to the root **עז**, "to be strong",

Reference to the destruction of the port city of Tarshish (תַּרְשִׁישׁ // מַחֲזוֹ) in v. 10 is particularly appropriate just before v. 11b, in which the prophet speaks directly of Yahweh's destructive purpose: "With regard to Canaan Yahweh has ordered // that its harbors/port cities be destroyed [לְשַׁמֵּד (18) מַעְוִיָּה]". (2) Verse 10 fits here also because of several *verbal connections* to the second colon of v. 11b. The two terms that make up this second colon refer back to two of the words restored in v. 10. (a) אָבַד forms a parallel word-pair with אָבַד which is attested 13x in the OT (19). (b) קָעַז has a connection with מַחֲזוֹ that is both semantic and sonic: the two terms are synonymous in this context and identical in terms of sound except for a single phoneme (20).

Second, a look at the *larger context* shows that the proposed reading fits better than the MT. (1) As restored, v. 10 is formally very similar to the poem's inclusion (vv. 1a, 14). All three verses begin with an imperative and conclude with כי + a verb of destruction (שָׁדַד or אָבַד) + a reference to a port city:

v. 1a	Wail	...	for destroyed is מבֵּית (21)
v. 14	Wail	...	for destroyed is your port city (מַעְוִיָּה)
v. 10	Cross over	...	for perished is Tarshish

(2) The MT takes בת־תַּרְשִׁישׁ as the subject of the feminine imperative עֲבְרִי. But this does not accord with the rest of the poem. Four other feminine

and derives rather from עָז, "to seek refuge". The root and the same nominal form are attested in Arabic with this meaning (*ma'ād* = קָעַז; see H. WEHR, *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic* [Ithaca, NY 1976] 656). In the MT the root of the nominal form is often confused with עָז, as may be seen from the frequent erroneous doubling of the *zayin* in this word. The term properly means "a place of refuge" > "haven." In the context of this poem the "haven" in question is a haven for ships, i.e., a harbor. This meaning of מַעֲוִיָּה in the poem has been recognized by H. WILDBERGER, *Isaiah 13-27* (Continental Commentary; Minneapolis 1997) 405.

(18) Read מַעְוִיָּה with 1QIsa^a instead of the MT's מַעְוִיָּה, which is probably a conflation of מַעֲוִיָּה and מַעֲוִיָּה (see S. TALMON, "Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in Light of Qumran Manuscripts", *Textus* 4 [1964] 124).

(19) Num 33,52; Deut 4,26; 7,24; 9,3; 28,20.51.63; Isa 26,14; Jer 48,8; Ezek 25,17; Esth 3,13; 7,4; Dan 7,26 (Aramaic). This word-pair was noted by Y. AVISHUR, *Stylistic Studies of Word-Pairs in Biblical and Ancient Semitic Literatures* (AOAT 210; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1984) 240, 472.

(20) In Isa 23,1-14 there are in fact three terms for "harbor/port city", all of which are closely related as to sound: קָעַז (vv. 4, 11b [read מַעְוִיָּה—see n. 18], 14), מַחֲזוֹ (v. 10), and קְבוּא (v. 1 [MT: מְבוּא]) = "entrance" > "port of entry" (see *NAB/REB* and Ezek 27,2). These three words—and they alone in this poem—have the following three features in common: all of them are bisyllabic, begin with *m*, and have an *ā-ō* vowel pattern.

(21) The fact that the first and last verses of the poem form an inclusion and are identical but for the last word — מבֵּית and מַעְוִיָּה — argues that these two words are synonymous and that the former is actually the name of a port city on the Phoenician trade routes (probably on Cyprus). It may be the "harbortown" connected with an important commercial center, of whose name no trace has been preserved in the historical record (it is only by the luck of discovery — certain Ugaritic tablets — that we know the name of Ugarit's main port, *Ma(ʿ)hādu*). The MT (mis)understands מבֵּית as "from/without a house", although it may preserve the correct consonants of the name. (The striking alliteration מְבוּא מבֵּית indicates that at least the first two letters may well be correct.) If this hypothesis is right, each of the terms for "port" in the poem — מְבוּא, מַחֲזוֹ, and מַעֲוִיָּה — is in parallelism with the name of a port city: *mbyt*, Tarshish, and Sidon respectively (Sidon is parallel to מְבוּא, "seaport", in v. 4). The first city-name, *mbyt*, is associated with two of these terms: with מְבוּא by means of "terrace parallelism" (see WATSON, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, §8.3 [pp. 208-211]) and with מַעְוִיָּה by "distant parallelism".

imperatives occur at the beginning of a stanza, as does עברי in v. 10: בושׁ (v. 4), “be ashamed”; עברי (v. 6), “cross over”; and קומי עברי (v. 12c), “arise and cross over”⁽²²⁾. These feminine imperatives are functionally significant within the poem, since they act as indicators of stanza divisions and also drive the action⁽²³⁾. Sidon is clearly the subject of the first and of the others as well. That this is true in the case of v. 10 is beyond question, as the only other 2d person form in this stanza is v. 12a, “You (fem. sg.) shall exult no longer,” which is followed immediately by the vocative, “virgin daughter Sidon”.

(3) Another feature that should be carefully noted with regard to the larger context is *the movements of Sidon* within the poem, which is indicated by the verb עברי. She is first told to cross over to Tarshish at the beginning of the third stanza (v. 6). Thus in v. 10 the command “cross (back) to your own land” makes sense because she is ostensibly in Tarshish. Finally, in v. 12c she is told to “cross over (the sea)” once more, this time from her land to Cyprus, which by way of inclusion takes us back to the beginning of the poem (cf. כדום in v. 1). Given this itinerary, a command to *Tarshish* in v. 10 to cross over to *her* own land makes no sense whatsoever. This is without doubt the source of the reading עברי ארצך, “Work/Till your land,” in 1QIsa^a and the LXX *Vorlage*, which is simply an attempt to make sense of a senseless imperative.

In this discussion of Isa 23,10 I have attempted to show that P. W. Flint’s restored *Vorlage* of the LXX establishes a Hebrew text more pristine than the MT or any of the Dead Sea Isaiah manuscripts. Building on that text I propose a reconstruction of this verse that not only makes sense in itself — unlike the MT — but fulfills two other requirements that every such restoration should fulfill: it conforms to the established conventions of Biblical Hebrew poetry and fits well within the context of this poem.

St. Mary’s Seminary & University
Baltimore, Maryland 21210 U.S.A.

Michael L. BARRÉ

SUMMARY

Isa 23,10 is a long recognized *crux interpretum* within what is a difficult passage in its own right, Isaiah’s oracle against Tyre (23,1-14). The MT makes no sense. The restoration of the LXX *Vorlage* reconstructed by P. W. Flint brings us closer to the “original text”, to the extent that only several minor errors separate us from what may be the original form of this verse. Once these are corrected the restored bicolon I propose not only makes good sense as a sentence but reads as good Biblical Hebrew poetry and fits the overall context very well.

⁽²²⁾ Of these, only the double imperative קומי עברי in v. 12 does not begin but rather ends a colon. In this respect these verbs differ from all the other feminine imperatives in the poem, and also by being a *double* imperative (the only example in the oracle). These differences are deliberate and by breaking the pattern established up to this point serve to signal the concluding stanza of the poem.

⁽²³⁾ As I see it, the poem divides into five stanzas: 1-3, 4-5, 6-9, 10-12b, 12c-14. The feminine imperatives occur in the first colon of each stanza but the first which begins with the indusionistic imperative הילילי (vv. 1a, 14a).

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

Eckart OTTO, *Gottes Recht als Menschrecht. Rechts- und literaturhistorische Studien zum Deuteronomium* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte 2). Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2002, vii-331 p. 17,5 × 23,5. € 78

Le principal problème auquel se trouve confronté l'exégète qui aborde la littérature deutéronomique et, bien entendu, le Deutéronome, est celui du genre littéraire. En effet, faut-il le lire comme un récit — ce à quoi nous encouragerait son style particulier (cf. G. Braulik, «Das Buch Deuteronomium», *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* [Hrsg. E. Zenger] [StTh I/1; Stuttgart 1998] 125-141) —, comme un texte théologique — si l'on s'en tient aux exhortations, nombreuses et particulièrement développées, donnant la signification profonde de l'Alliance —, ou à texte juridique — ce que suggère le «Code deutéronomique» de Dt 12—26. Le titre choisi par Eckart Otto pour son ouvrage montre qu'il n'a pas échappé à ce triple dilemme. Se plaçant préférentiellement dans la perspective d'une lecture «juridique» du Deutéronome, il n'en devait pas moins traiter les autres dimensions de ce texte difficile dont l'histoire de la composition (cf. M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11* [AB 5.1; New York 1991] Introduction 9-13) a généré une littérature imposante. C'est sans doute poussé par cette nécessité qu'il a divisé son travail en deux parties d'inégale longueur, la première (la plus brève) consacrée au *Sitz im Leben* du Deutéronome et la seconde, plus longue, au droit deutéronomique ressaisi dans le contexte du droit oriental ancien, avec une ouverture marquée sur l'arrière-plan «éthique» du droit biblique.

Dans un premier temps donc, ce volume va s'intéresser au Deutéronome en tant qu'unité intégrée à l'ensemble biblique, en relisant l'histoire de sa composition et celle de son intégration au Pentateuque. Pour ce dernier point on doit d'ailleurs être reconnaissant à l'auteur du développement qu'il consacre à la question de la place initiale du Deutéronome dans les Livres bibliques (20-56). En effet, la plus ancienne version de Dt avait sans doute été rattachée à l'ensemble formé par Josué, 1–2 Samuel et 1–2 Rois; ce n'est que par la suite, lors de la «révision» du livre, qu'il a été intégré au Pentateuque comme sa conclusion naturelle. Quelle que soit l'hypothèse de travail à laquelle on se rallie, il est nécessaire de prendre en compte cette histoire du texte en deux grands moments qui, seule, permet de résoudre la solution de continuité entre ce que l'on pourrait nommer un «Deutéronome préexilique» et un «Deutéronome exilique (ou post-exilique)». E. Otto aborde d'ailleurs cette dernière problématique (29-34) en posant la question du *Deutéronome deutéronomiste* de l'Exil.

Rappelons que toute cette première partie constitue en fait comme une vaste «introduction» à l'étude du «droit» deutéronomique qui est l'objet essentiel de ce volume. Il ne faut donc pas y rechercher une étude exhaustive des sources, de la composition, et des buts du Deutéronome. On peut cependant regretter que l'auteur — avant de s'intéresser plus particulièrement, dans la seconde partie, au droit et à ses implications éthiques — n'ait pas approfondi davantage l'importance du Deutéronome dans l'évolution, et même la mutation de la religion d'Israël. Ainsi que l'a si pertinemment mis en évidence M. Weinfeld (*Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* [Oxford 1972] 35-36) la théologie deutéronomiste — inséparable des autres dimensions de ce livre — s'inscrit dans la droite ligne de 1R 8,14-69, ce fameux *discours de Salomon*, qui définit le Temple de Jérusalem non pas comme une «habitation pour Dieu» mais comme le lieu du culte rendu au Dieu d'Israël qui réside «dans les cieux» (1R 8,30.39.43.49). Cette approche renouvelée du caractère transcendant du Dieu d'Israël commande toute la lecture que nous pouvons et devons faire du Deutéronome pour saisir la portée non seulement de l'interprétation historique qui y est faite mais, principalement, celle des lois et des prescriptions légales. Cette théologie est évidemment abordée par E. Otto, mais uniquement dans la seconde partie de son livre et comme le «support», en tant que théologie de l'Alliance, du développement des lois deutéronomiques.

Rappelons sommairement l'originalité du Code deutéronomique à laquelle l'auteur donne un ample développement qui, disons-le d'emblée, reçoit notre pleine adhésion. Par rapport au Code de l'Alliance (Ex 20,22-23,19) et à la Loi de sainteté (Lv 11,19-22 et 25-26), la centralisation du culte est affirmée avec force ainsi que le monopole sacerdotal de la tribu de Lévi et l'institution monarchique apparaît comme définitivement admise. Enfin, et c'est là le plus important, la structure tribale qui sous-tend les autres «lois» bibliques n'est plus évoquée au profit d'une conception d'Israël conçu plus comme une «grande famille» que comme un agrégat de clans. Nous sommes, d'évidence, en présence des lois de la période monarchique et plus particulièrement de VII^e siècles av. J.-C. qui a connu à la fois les troubles de la disparition du royaume du Nord, la réforme josianique et la première rédaction des Livres historiques. Même si le texte reçu du Deutéronome est postérieur, sa matière, et particulièrement sa matière juridique, est tributaire de cette époque.

Bien des biblistes ont étudié les rapports entre les lois deutéronomiques et les autres lois bibliques, ou entre le Deutéronome en tant qu'unité littéraire et les autres livres de la Bible. Mais, à part quelques notes ou excursus, il n'y a que fort peu d'études consacrées exclusivement à la dépendance des lois deutéronomiques par rapport à leur environnement. Par ce dernier mot, nous entendons l'influence du droit d'autres états — particulièrement des états dominants — sur la forme et le fond des textes qui nous intéressent ici. Or, le VII^e siècle av. J.-C. doit être resitué dans le cadre de la domination exercée par l'empire néo-assyrien dont les «royaumes» occidentaux (Phénicie, Israël, Juda) sont tributaires. Nous avons maintenant une bonne connaissance du droit néo-assyrien et il devenait urgent de faire une étude parallèle des deux droits — cunéiforme et biblique — de la même époque. C'est à partir de ce travail que E. Otto développe son analyse des lois deutéronomiques, montrant

à la fois les convergences et les divergences entre les deux droits. A cet effet, les pages (195-219) qu'il consacre à la *praxis* juridique néo-assyrienne non seulement en Mésopotamie mais dans les pays dépendants de l'empire ninivite sont particulièrement importantes et éclairantes, d'autant plus qu'elle précèdent immédiatement l'étude de la réception des lois deutéronomiques. On s'aperçoit alors que le souci «éthique» de ces lois, loin d'être une particularité du droit biblique, transparait dans bien d'autres textes juridiques du Proche-Orient ancien pour cette même époque. Par ailleurs, la notion d'Alliance — dont on connaît l'importance pour l'intelligence du texte biblique — doit également être abordée, particulièrement en ce qui concerne le Deutéronome, à la lumière de ce qu'en dit le droit cunéiforme ; l'excursus consacré à ce problème par E. Otto (128-166) doit être lu avec soin et les indications qu'il donne sur l'idéologie royale néo-assyrienne (idéologie que l'on retrouve dans les Ps 2, 18, 72 et 89) et sur son influence dans les écrits bibliques est importante.

On comprend que, si ces «lois royales» de Juda disent et visent à préserver la spécificité du royaume, elles ne doivent pas moins s'inscrire, quelque part, dans ce mouvement juridique des VIII^e-VII^e siècles av. J.-C. Une étude exhaustive — esquissée ici — sur ce véritable renouveau juridique serait d'ailleurs des plus intéressante.

Jusqu'à présent, on a répété à l'envie que l'intérêt essentiel du Code deutéronomique résidait dans sa théologie (cf. A. Boudart «Deutéronomique, code», *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de la Bible* [Turnhout 1987] 348). Sans nier aucunement que la théologie deutéronomiste soit de grande importance pour la théologie biblique et l'intelligence des écrits prophétiques, on doit prendre conscience que le droit deutéronomique constitue aussi un moment particulièrement important dans l'histoire du droit biblique. L'un des grands mérites de la minutieuse étude que consacre Eckart Otto à ce livre et à ses implications est de mettre ce point en lumière tout en montrant les originalités et les dépendances du Deutéronome.

Abbaye Saint-Martin
F-86240 Ligugé

Lucien-Jean BORD

F.V. GREIFENHAGEN, *Egypt on the Pentateuch's Ideological Map. Constructing Biblical Israel's Identity* (JSOTSS 361). London, Sheffield Academic Press, 2002. xi-325 p. 16 × 24. € 65.00.

In a religion where the deity is defined as the one who led his people out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage, a book on the perception of the land left by the people who left is most welcome. This book is a revision of the author's 1998 dissertation *Egypt in the Symbolic Geography of the Pentateuch: Constructing Biblical Israel's Identity* at Duke University under the direction of James L. Crenshaw. The book includes some revisions but not an update of any material.

The opening sentence of the book refers to the shadows which Egypt casts over the Pentateuch with 53% of the explicit references to either “Egypt” or “Egyptian” in the Hebrew Bible appearing there. Unlike previous scholars who sought to combine the analysis of biblical texts with the archaeological and textual discoveries from Egypt in the search for an historical kernel, the author declines to approach Egypt as a geographic reference. Instead, the author claims the use of Egypt in the Pentateuch functions as “a multivalent metaphor or symbol” (6). This construct or mental map of Egypt thus becomes a clue to the perceptions and values of the people who identified themselves as “not Egypt” and who created the Pentateuch as an expression of that self-perception.

The author posits a “master origin narrative” of the Pentateuch. The origins of the people are to be found in Mesopotamia, the setting for the primeval stories and the departure point for Abraham. Egypt is inserted into the master narrative as a (long) detour before the people are able to assume permanent residence in the land promised to them. The question the author wishes to address is the reason for this detour through Egypt (11). The theme the author will develop in the book is that all is not black or white in the Pentateuch with respect to Egypt. Despite the obvious rejection of Egypt in the primary narrative, there is an alternative voice which also has been retained in the biblical narrative, one where Egypt is not simply a place of slavery but a well-watered garden as in Gen 13,10 comparable to the Mesopotamian garden of creation. The author finds “ambiguities” throughout the examples of the Egyptian stories analyzed in the book that signify the existence of this persistent but less heard voice in the Pentateuch that favors Egypt.

Perhaps the question of most interest to readers is when did this process of creating the Pentateuch with this particular mental map occur. The author’s sole concern here is with the final form of the text. The book does not address the issue of the format of the material prior to its final formation as the Pentateuch. In the concluding section of the opening chapter the author states that the Neo-Babylonian, Persian, and early Hellenistic periods will be evaluated to determine the time of formation. The references to Egypt in the text with the resulting mental map will be shown to be a contemporary expression arising from one of these three time periods.

In Chapter 5, “The Production and Promulgation of the ‘Final Text Form’ of the Pentateuch”, the author seeks to determine when this action occurred. The author examines the manuscript evidence for the Pentateuch, the non-Pentateuchal documents that show an awareness of the Pentateuch such as Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, the non-biblical material which express an awareness of the Pentateuch like the *Letter of Aristeas* and Ben Sira, and, finally, non-Jewish writings from the early Hellenistic period such as Herodotus’s *History*. The conclusion the author reaches in summarizing this analysis is that this “evidence cumulatively, although not conclusively, points to the fifth or early fourth century BCE as the most likely period during which the final text form of the Pentateuch was produced and promulgated” (221). As to why such an action was undertaken by the Yehud people, the answer combines internal needs and the “external pressure exerted by the Persian empire for standardized law” (223). Part of the

fascination of this chapter is that the author arrives at the conclusion that the formation of the final text of the Pentateuch occurred c. 450-350 BCE period without any reference either to Egypt or the proposed mental map of Egypt contained in the Pentateuch.

Thus Chapter 5 goes to the heart of the issue. Members of the guild do not approach the Pentateuch as a *tabula rasa* concerning its date of writing or formation. Since the author's conclusion that the Pentateuch was created partially under Persian duress exists independently of the analysis of any Egyptian references, it raises the questions of which came first: the analysis of the stories in Genesis/Deuteronomy in Chapters 2-4 or the conclusion that the Pentateuch was a Persian period creation in Chapter 5 (see 256)? Given the conclusion that the Pentateuch is a product of the Persian period, it is hardly surprising that one also would interpret the ideological themes of the text to reflect the Persian historical context. Here is where the author's contrast of Mesopotamian and Egyptian origins of Israel becomes important.

A second critical assumption of the author is in the use of Mesopotamia. The author posits a master narrative based on a Mesopotamian origin with a detour to Egypt. The author states that "the primeval and Jacob cycles are oriented predominantly toward Mesopotamia" (24). The Jacob cycle receives one paragraph in the book since there is only one reference to Egypt in Gen 25,19-36,43. By contrast, Jacob marries a woman from the "old country" whereby "the overall orientation of the Jacob cycle toward Mesopotamia is underlined ..." (33). With the Tigris, Euphrates, and Babel, the primeval connections to Mesopotamia are undisputed; with Haran and the Aramaeans, the connection is less clear. Mesopotamia, after all, is a Greek construct, a Greek mental map which scholars have readily accepted. The author chooses to understand the credo of Deut 26,5b-9 and the Aramaean relatives of Jacob within the context of the Aramaic linguistic predominance in Neo-Babylonian times asserting that such Mesopotamian links would be well received by the Persians, recent conquerors of Babylon (201-202 and Chapter 6 "The Historical Context: Egypt and Israel"). This explanation certainly is plausible but so is an interpretation that the connection arose in Iron II when Israel and Aram were both allies against a real Mesopotamian country (and enemies at other times) or in Iron I when both Merneptah's Israel and Tiglath-pileser's Aramaeans entered the archaeological record.

As one would expect in a book on Egypt in the Pentateuch, the Exodus garners the bulk of the analytical effort. Here the author proceeds almost by chapter and verse through the Pentateuchal books covering that event. The author examines the different pericopes such as the burning bush, the plagues, Passover, and the departure in an attempt to reach closure on three identities, that of Yahweh, Israel, and Moses (see the diagram on 69). The author shows that the text contains a clearcut differentiation between Yahweh and Pharaoh to the point of a cosmic conflict between the two them for the people Israel. With Pharaoh and Yahweh there is no doubt about their separateness, no ambiguities, no tensions. This confrontation contains the strongest language and actions identifying Egypt as "other".

Simultaneously, the author finds ambiguities and tensions in the identities of Moses and Israel in the story of the Exodus. Moses is portrayed as and is considered by the Hebrews to be a member of the house of Egypt; he commits

premeditated murder of an Egyptian; and which is the “strange land” after which he names his first born son, Midian or Egypt? Moses is given a legitimate genealogy in Ex 6, but then disappears while Aaron’s descendants are named. Certainly the people are in constant conflict with their leader as one murmuring incident follows another. The author writes, “The ambivalent status of Moses will continue to beset the narrative of the Pentateuch with an ideological contradiction between origins intrinsic and extrinsic to Egypt” (148).

In a footnote (65, n. 77), the author alerts the reader to the similarity between the Moses story of departure from Egypt and that of Sinuhe, a hero from a Middle Kingdom story. The author repeats this reference in the text (83; an index of proper nouns and not just authors or biblical verses would help). One wonders what the point is of twice alluding to these similarities. Does the author mean to suggest that the audience of the text would make a similar connection between the stories? If so, then shouldn’t the striking dissimilarities be noted as well?

Sinuhe flees to the wilderness after he thinks he will be implicated in an assassination plot against the king; marries the boss’s daughter, prospers, and returns to Egypt without his family so he can be buried as a true Egyptian near his king. He is home at last. Moses murders a representative of Pharaoh’s authority, flees to the wilderness, marries the boss’s daughter and returns to Egypt without his people. The author notes that his family accompanies him part way before disappearing from the narrative. These actions are part of tension the author detects in the narrative with Moses appearing as a high-position Egyptian in this alternative narrative subsumed within the larger anti-Egyptian narrative. But no mention is made of the contrast in the endings between the two stories. Moses does not return to be buried with Pharaoh, he returns to bury Pharaoh (pardon the poetic license). The author raises the point of the Sinuhe-like qualities of Moses without commenting on the diametrically contrasting endings.

What the biblical narrative has done is to turn the Egyptian cultural construct topsy-turvy, to use the English translation. Israel was not the only one with a mental map or cultural construct. Egypt had a very well defined language of cosmos and chaos. Egypt had a clear perception of the order and harmony of the universe (*ma’at*), of Pharaoh’s responsibility to maintain that order, and of who the forces of chaos were who disrupted that order both in the heavens and on earth. The Egyptian cultural construct is extremely clear about who is to be raised in hiding in the Delta, about who is to win the nocturnal confrontation between cosmos and chaos, about who is responsible for maintaining the environment, about when water is to flood and not to flood, and of the place of the alien wilderness wanderer in the universe. The Pharaoh who had a heavy heart would not fare well in the Egyptian view of the world to come.

According to the analysis of the author, the people responsible for the Pentateuch had almost no awareness of the Egyptian cultural construct (101, n. 205) just as they had limited awareness of the Egyptian geography. If that is so, then the author’s references to Sinuhe should not have been made. Once the author has legitimized the awareness of that story, one cannot then preclude the possibility that the writers of the Pentateuch were also aware of

a host of other second-millennium BCE stories, admonitions, and cultural traits including the long-remembered Hyksos with their own 400-year tradition of being in Egypt. It just may be possible that even before Persia and Herodotus, there were West Semites familiar with the Egyptian mental map and who rejected it as firmly as did the people of the first commandment.

The author has proposed two distinct voices about the origins of Israel, one based on Egypt and the other on Mesopotamia. The author suggests that the Mesopotamian one, meaning Abraham, trumps the Egyptian one, meaning Moses (257-260), centuries before Paul uses Abraham to achieve the same end. The author even refers to Abraham's journey to Egypt in Gen 12 as a "proto-exodus movement" (30) without addressing the possibility that the use of Moses and Abraham might represent conflicts internal to Israel independent of Persia. Such divisions might just as easily reflect tensions of long duration between Israelites (Amorites, Benjaminites) who looked to Mesopotamia and Israelites (Canaanites, Josephites) who looked to Egypt each with their respective priesthoods ... which then raises the issue of how people of such diametrically contrasting orientations came together in history to be a single people in the first place.

Egypt's relationship with Israel dates back at least to Merneptah and even earlier with the West Semites. The mental maps of both peoples changed over the years. This sense of movement in time is lost when one limits oneself to a final formation and undermines the basis for one's conclusions by transforming diachronic change into synchronic tensions. Imagine analyzing the amended American Constitution in its final form and ignoring the dynamics which produced the changes. On the other hand, isolating a text or time period for analysis is an absolute necessity for a doctoral student who needs to complete a dissertation now to graduate.

The author has raised important issues in the effort to understand the Israel's identity as expressed in the Pentateuch. The task is a daunting one as even the effort to isolate a single trait, relationship to Egypt, and time period, Persian, can raise more questions than can be answered in a single dissertation, book, or book review. One hopes that the effort will increase the discussion about Egypt and Israel in ancient times.

P.O. Box 41
Purchase, NY 10577

Peter FEINMAN

Novum Testamentum

Ombretta PISANO, *La radice e la stirpe di David. Salmi davidici nel libro dell'Apocalisse* (Tesi Gregoriana Serie Teologia 85). Roma, Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2002. 487 p. 17 × 24. € 27,00 – \$ 27,00

L'Apocalisse di Giovanni è piena di riferimenti alle Scritture veterotestamentarie e si costituisce come una sua rilettura cristiana: l'autore-profeta, infatti, si presenta come uno attraverso il quale il Cristo risorto viene a parlare nell'assemblea, dal momento che il suo compito è proprio quello di interpretare la storia e la Scrittura. Pertanto l'analisi dei rapporti che legano l'Apocalisse con l'Antico Testamento occupa gli studiosi da almeno un secolo: in questa vasta ricerca si colloca l'opera di Ombretta Pisano, presentata come dissertazione per il dottorato in Teologia Biblica presso la Pontificia Università Gregoriana, sotto la guida del professore Ugo Vanni.

Il primo capitolo di questo lavoro affronta proprio la questione fondamentale dell'uso che l'Apocalisse fa dei testi veterotestamentari: con una panoramica sintetica vengono infatti presentati anzitutto i principali studi generali sul problema: accanto alle opere classiche di H.B. Swete (1906), A. Schlatter (1912) e R.H. Charles (1920), sono analizzate le recenti pubblicazioni di S. Moyise (*The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation* [JSNTSS 115; Sheffield 1995]) e G.K. Beale (*John's Use of the Old Testament in Revelation* [JSNTSS 166; Sheffield 1998]). Inoltre vengono valorizzati gli apporti di M.-É. Boismard e L.A. Vos, che non hanno pubblicato studi specifici sull'argomento; mentre stupisce che non siano citati, nemmeno in bibliografia, articoli specifici di B. Corsani («L'uso dell'Antico Testamento nell'Apocalisse», *La Bibbia nell'antichità cristiana. I. Da Gesù a Origene* [ed. E. Norelli] [Bologna 1993] 181-197), A. Lancellotti («L'Antico Testamento nell'Apocalisse», *RivB* 14 [1966] 369-384), M. Nobile («L'Apocalisse: una lettura cristiana dell'Antico Testamento», *Atti del V Simposio di Efeso su San Giovanni Apostolo* [ed. L. Padovese] [Roma 1995] 127-138) e dello stesso U. Vanni («L'Apocalisse: rilettura cristiana messianica dell'Antico Testamento», *L'Antico Testamento interpretato dal Nuovo. Il Messia* [ed. G. De Gennaro] [Napoli 1985] 455-480).

In secondo luogo sono presentate le ricerche specifiche sull'utilizzazione di un singolo libro biblico nell'Apocalisse. Questo approccio, iniziato con un articolo di A. Vanhoye («L'utilisation du livre d'Ezéchiel dans l'Apocalypse», *Bib* 43 [1962] 436-476) a proposito di Ezechiele, ha visto molti altri interventi, che vengono qui dettagliatamente analizzati, per mostrare l'uso che l'Apocalisse fa dei profeti: Daniele (G.K. Beale [1984]), Ezechiele (J.-P. Ruiz [1989]) e Isaia (A. Gangemi [1974], B. Marconcini [1976], J. Fekkes [1994]). Mancano invece riferimenti a studi minori sulla presenza nell'Apocalisse di testi tratti da Genesi ed Esodo, da Geremia e Osea; mentre viene evidenziato che l'unico studio sui Salmi nell'Apocalisse è quello di J.L. Monge García, pubblicato in lingua spagnola sulla rivista *Cistercium* in due parti, negli anni 1976-1977. Proprio questa lacu-

na intende colmare la tesi di O. Pisano, studiando la funzione significativa che il salterio svolge nel contesto liturgico dell'Apocalisse e come il suo autore si serva dei Salmi per descrivere l'identità e il ruolo del Cristo risorto nella storia.

Dopo una introduzione che presenta lo scopo e i limiti della ricerca, nonché la struttura del lavoro, l'opera si divide in due parti ben distinte: la prima affronta tre questioni introduttive, mentre la seconda contiene lo studio specifico sulla presenza dei Salmi nell'Apocalisse. Infine alcuni rilievi conclusivi mettono in evidenza i contributi che questa ricerca ha apportato alla questione e tre appendici completano il quadro della situazione. Nel suo complesso il lavoro è impostato in modo metodologicamente corretto, passando dal generale allo specifico, organizzando bene il percorso di ricerca per giungere a precise conclusioni; l'Autrice, infatti, dimostra abilità espositiva e capacità di controllare la materia molto vasta, alternando momenti di profonda analisi con quadri sintetici che permettono al lettore di orientarsi nell'intricato percorso esegetico ed ermeneutico.

Alla panoramica bibliografica del primo capitolo fa seguito un altro studio introduttivo sulla valorizzazione del salterio nel mondo giudaico in cui è inserita la comunità dell'Apocalisse: partendo dall'opera del Cronista e passando attraverso le testimonianze di Qumran, del Nuovo Testamento, della Mishnah, degli scritti cristiani del II/III secolo e di alcuni pseudoepigrafi, l'Autrice ricerca indizi sull'attribuzione a Davide dei Salmi e sul modo in cui veniva usata liturgicamente tale raccolta di preghiere bibliche. Finisce così per riconoscere una teologia della figura davidica in rapporto al suo ruolo fondativo del culto e in rapporto alla profezia messianica che si apre alla visione: qui sta l'elemento principale che mostra la forza performativa della salmodia, spiccatamente comunitaria. Nel gruppo che usa i Salmi, infatti, l'indole profetica passa dal contenuto alla recita, giacché la comunità recitante si connota come «assemblea visionaria»: proprio mentre recita i Salmi, essa vede, rivela e incarna realtà escatologiche.

E ciò che poteva valere per la comunità giudaica del secondo Tempio e per il gruppo sacerdotale del Mar Morto, assume particolare valore anche per l'assemblea cristiana a cui è rivolta l'Apocalisse di Giovanni: soprattutto in situazioni belliche ovvero in momenti di crisi la recita della salmodia è considerata efficace nel combattimento contro i nemici, in quanto affermazione della capacità vittoriosa di Dio posta al servizio del suo popolo. In tal modo i Salmi svolgono una duplice funzione: come interpretazione degli eventi celebrano la fedeltà di Dio nel passato e come potenza creatrice di novità garantiscono il suo intervento nel futuro.

Particolare interesse merita, a questo proposito, la documentazione sulla presenza nell'ambiente storico dell'Apocalisse di cantori ufficiali che avevano il compito di celebrare l'imperatore divinizzato (146-148): senza arrivare ad immaginare una «corporazione» di cantori cristiani, è possibile riconoscere nel procedimento giovanneo l'intento di insistere sulla forza performante che la salmodia ha nello svolgimento della storia in contrapposizione con l'innodia pagana che ha solo funzione celebrativa.

La terza e ultima delle questioni introduttive riguarda più specificatamente il Cristo «davidico» dell'Apocalisse, cioè il rapporto che l'ultimo libro del NT stabilisce fra il Messia Gesù e il personaggio biblico di Davi-

de. Oltre ad alcuni elementi davidici presenti nell'Apocalisse (l'arca, il tempio, Gerusalemme, il popolo), sono determinanti tre versetti in cui Davide è espressamente nominato in rapporto col Cristo e questi si presenta alla comunità come «Colui che la chiave di Davide» (3,7), nella scena dell'Agnello vincitore viene evocato come «la radice di Davide» (5,5) e, infine, nell'ultimo dialogo liturgico egli torna a qualificarsi come «la radice e la stirpe di Davide» (22,16). Proprio da quest'ultima espressione trae il titolo lo studio in questione, dal momento che l'Autrice la ritiene particolarmente importante per il suo significato teologico. Infatti, se *radice* esprime l'origine, il termine *stirpe* (γένος) è piuttosto da comprendersi come il risultato prodotto dalla radice e — in prospettiva ecclesiale — designa il nuovo popolo regale: Cristo, dunque, è presentato in profonda solidarietà con la sua gente e, unito all'assemblea escatologica prodigiosamente nata dalla radice nascosta, trasforma la storia da «promessa» in «visione» per mezzo della stessa salmodia, il tratto peculiare del Davide tradizionale.

Pur condividendo la precisa esegesi di questi testi e le conclusioni teologiche a cui conduce, risultano tuttavia un po' forzati i passi (cf. 198) in cui per applicare l'immagine della chiave di Davide si descrive Cristo che apre i sigilli «come si apre una porta, un edificio... cioè *come* con una chiave» e per evidenziare il valore liturgico della recita dei Salmi nell'Apocalisse si afferma che l'accesso alla liturgia celeste garantita da Cristo «avviene attraverso il ricorso alla salmodia».

All'inizio della seconda parte, una nuova introduzione precisa che per «Salmi davidici» vengono intesi solo quei Salmi regali e messianici che sono in relazione con il re Davide: fra questi la presente ricerca individua presenti nell'Apocalisse solo i Salmi 2, 18, 21, 89, 101, 110, 132, 144. Quindi in una tabella sintetica (228) l'Autrice mostra le altre identificazioni di versetti salmici secondo alcuni studi che si sono occupati della questione (Swete, Charles, Nestle-Aland, Monge García, Zamagni): è così possibile riconoscere facilmente le novità proposte dalla Pisano.

Il capitolo quarto è il più corposo dell'opera (231-333), essendo dedicato all'uso del Salmo 2, la cui presenza è riconosciuta nella struttura stessa dell'Apocalisse, in quanto Salmo della regalità di Cristo partecipata ai suoi fedeli che supera la drammatica opposizione dei re della terra, garantendo la solidità del regno universale. L'utilizzo dei versetti di questo Salmo nell'Apocalisse permette di evidenziare tre poli principali: l'autorità di Cristo sulle nazioni attraverso il simbolo dello scettro di ferro (Ap 2,26-27; 12,5; 19,15); l'ira di Dio e dell'Agnello contro le forze ribelli (Ap 6,15; 16,12-16; 17,7-18); la celebrazione del nuovo regno universale (Ap 11,15-19; 14,1-5; 21,3). Lo studio di questi nove passi è svolto secondo l'ordine dell'Apocalisse, con lo svantaggio di passare da brani in cui la citazione del Salmo è evidente e riconosciuta da tutti ad altri molto più complessi e difficili da dimostrare. Forse poteva essere preferibile un processo di studio che muovesse dai dati più chiari per allargarsi a quelli più oscuri e opinabili, in modo da illuminare progressivamente l'intera questione: le conclusioni, poi, avrebbero potuto offrire la ricostruzione del procedimento giovanneo per l'uso tematico di questo Salmo nell'organizzazione progressiva della sua opera. In ogni caso le argomentazioni dell'Autrice sono precise e puntuali, coerenti con il grado di difficoltà del testo, oneste nel

riconoscere che certi passaggi si possono intuire, ma non dimostrare. Fra le proposte originali della Pisano si può notare e apprezzare il riferimento al Salmo 2 per alcuni passi apocalittici in cui non era stato notato: la scena dell'Agnello vincitore sul Sion con il seguito dei 144.000 (14,1-5) e la strana formula di alleanza che connota la comunità della nuova Gerusalemme come «suoi popoli» (21,3). Ugualmente interessante ritengo il riferimento al Salmo 2 (riconosciuto solo dal Charles) per il quadro della sesta coppa che mostra il raduno dei re per la guerra del gran giorno (16,12-16), dove il simbolico luogo del monte di Meghiddo ha probabile riferimento al monte Sion in cui Dio ha insediato il “davidico” Cristo nella sua vittoria pasquale.

Agli altri Salmi davidici è riservato il capitolo quinto e uno studio molto più rapido ed essenziale: anche in questo caso, piuttosto che seguire l'ordine numerico dei Salmi sarebbe stato forse più utile per il lettore partire dai testi comunemente riconosciuti presenti nell'Apocalisse come il Salmo 89 (in Ap 1,5; 3,14; 17,18; 19,16; 21,1-8) e il 144 (in Ap 5,8-10), per poi passare alle nuove proposte di identificazione di versetti salmici in altri passi dell'opera giovannea. Comunque, oltre ai precisi chiarimenti sull'applicazione del Salmo 89 sulla crisi del messianismo davidico alla paradossale vicenda di Gesù Messia crocifisso, sono degne di apprezzamento le numerose proposte ermeneutiche che riconoscono dietro ad immagini dell'Apocalisse la presenza di testi provenienti dai Salmi. Così i temi del ringraziamento regale (Sal 18) sono riconosciuti nel canto di vittoria di Ap 12,13-18; le immagini della corona e dell'arco proprie del bianco cavaliere di Ap 6,2 (e 19,12.15) sono riconducibili all'inno per il re che parte in battaglia (Sal 21); la “pulizia etica” della città di Dio può essere derivata dal programma di governo del buon re (Sal 101); dal grandioso Sal 110 l'Apocalisse può aver derivato le immagini dell'ira e del combattimento (cf. Ap 6,16), nonché il simbolo della stella mattutina in base al testo greco di Sal 109,3 (cf. Ap 22,16); e così le immagini della dimora divina (Ap 21,3) e dell'Agnello che è lampada per la nuova città (Ap 21,23) possono giustamente derivare dal Sal 132. Non tutte queste dipendenze convincono nello stesso modo, ma si propongono in modo valido per ampliare la comprensione del vastissimo patrimonio culturale e biblico che soggiace al testo dell'Apocalisse.

Nonostante queste numerose proposte nuove, l'Autrice non è incline a vedere “comunque” un riferimento a Salmi: lo evidenzia nella prima Appendice, in cui si impegna a respingere le proposte che altri studiosi hanno fatto, negando l'influsso di versetti dei Salmi 72 e 89 nell'Apocalisse.

Nell'insieme il testo si presenta corretto e preciso, le numerose citazioni in greco ed ebraico sono generalmente esatte, anche se non mancano alcuni errori di stampa (cf. ad esempio: *finne* [141], *bttaglia* [154], *ignoranza* [158], *non'altro* [202]), imprecisioni editoriali (a p. 103 c'è spazio bianco al posto di un nome; a p. 109 il numerale 27° concorda con edizione; a p. 124 il paragrafo dovrebbe essere siglato 2.1.2; la nota 45 di p. 113 ripete la stessa nota 3 di p. 8; l'espressione un po' strana di “davidico” oscilla continuamente fra maiuscolo e minuscolo), frequenti sbagli di accentazione del greco (cf. ad esempio la ripetizione alle pp. 196-197 della coppia verbale ἀνοιγεῖν-λυεῖν al posto di ἀνοίγειν-λύειν) e qualche im-

precisione nell'ebraico (a p. 391, ad esempio, si connette la radice di *matino* [בקר-bqr] con quella di *primogenito* [בכור-bkwr]).

I rilievi conclusivi fanno apprezzare l'opera di Ombretta Pisano come un valido contributo allo studio del patrimonio biblico che anima la comunità dell'Apocalisse: giustamente l'Autrice sottolinea come non convenga parlare di «uso» esplicito di testi biblici, ma piuttosto di una «presenza» evocatrice. Il gioco dell'intertestualità, infatti, coinvolge in modo grandioso non solo diversi testi, ma soprattutto l'autore e i destinatari: proprio lo studio attento di queste numerose evocazioni di temi tratti dai Salmi davidici permette di apprezzare il metodo con cui Giovanni educa a tenere presenti le Scritture in una «sinossi dialogante» orientata al loro ascolto qualitativo (cf. 417).

Infine il contributo più notevole che quest'opera offre alla comprensione teologica dell'Apocalisse sembra essere la stretta connessione che viene dimostrata fra le affermazioni cristologiche e le conseguenze ecclesiali: i riferimenti ai Salmi davidici, infatti, indicano nell'Apocalisse una linea continua che «unisce la figura di Cristo con quella della Chiesa» (424), permettendo di riconoscere nella preghiera dei Salmi, così come era vissuta dalla comunità cristiana di Giovanni, la funzione profetica della liturgia che incide sulla storia (10). Infatti «ogni cristiano, contemplando il Davidico Risorto come suo perenne alleato, è invitato ad esercitare la sua capacità di sapienza e valutare che senso abbia per la sua vita il fatto che Cristo è con lui come il Davidico che vince» (425).

Via Ponzone, 5
I - 17100 SAVONA

Claudio DOGLIO

Karl Olav SANDNES, *Belly and Body in the Pauline Epistles* (SNTS 120). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002. xiv-318 p. 14 × 22. L45.00 - \$60.00

This study has as its center the exegesis of two texts: Phil 3,19 ("Their end is destruction; their god is the belly; and their glory is their shame; their minds are set on earthly things") and Rom 16,18 ("For such people do not serve our Lord Christ, but their own appetites..."). In both cases the Greek word translated alternatively by the NRSV as "belly" and "appetite" is κοιλία. Sandnes proposes that Paul is using a topos well known to the Graeco-Roman world; to properly interpret Paul's intention it is critical to find out how this traditional idiom functioned in these classical sources. For the texts under consideration it is proposed that κοιλία functions as a Pauline codeword for proper use of the body in light of the believers faith in Christ.

A review of the classical sources indicates that κοιλία is a slogan for a life controlled by pleasure and that the ancient writers closely connect it to discussions of the highest good. Sandnes notes, for example, some useful parallels between Plato and Paul - despite their radically locations and presuppositions. "Plato urges his Academy members to renounce the desires

of belly, because their identity is rooted not in the earthly but in the heavenly and divine. Who they are is decisive for how they relate to food" (42). Particular attention is given to the widespread criticism of the Epicurean "pleasure principle" in antiquity, especially by Seneca and Plutarch. This principle, certainly not limited to the Epicureans, is to be seen in the "after-dinner" pleasures offered at banquets, whether *symposia* or *cenae*. Theophrastus (*Characters* 20,10) speaks especially of the post-dinner sexual pleasures, Cicero refers to these entertainments as *quae sequuntur* (*Fin* 2,23) and Philo (*Contempl* 54) as ἐπιδειπνίδες.

Throughout this volume it is emphasized that it is unlikely that Paul uses the term κοιλία to refer to those Christians who are practicing Jewish food laws and this theme is developed in the discussion of the belly-topos in the chapters dealing with Jewish-Hellenistic sources and Philo. There can be little doubt, for example, that in 3 Macc 7,10-11 the phrase γαστήρ ἐνεκεν refers to apostatized Jews; as a result there cannot be any correlation between the belly and dietary laws. In 4 Macc 13,1-5 as well, the text suggests that the stomach is "a power from within, which entices a Jew to break food laws" (102). This same position is maintained by Philo who argues that "belly-devotion is a sign of paganism" and that "worshipping the stomach is idolatry" (132). Briefly put, then, Jewish Hellenism appropriates the Graeco-Roman topos of the belly and Paul represents a modification of this tendency. Both, however, insist that authentic piety is expressed in bodily ways, especially in controlling the passions.

Turning specifically to the passage in Philippians, Sandnes understands the belly reference as a denial of Christ's suffering and self-sacrifice as described in the hymn found in Phil 2,6-11. Those who follow such a pattern of life not only deny the pattern of life modeled by Christ but they are also unworthy of citizenship in the heavenly *politeuma* (Phil 3,20). This line of argument suggests that Paul is in dialogue with two different groups of opponents: Jewish-Christian opposition, on the one hand, and those, on the other hand, within the community who are tempted by a sensualist lifestyle. "Having left behind a piety based on Jewish customs (Phil 3,7-9), Paul claims that this is by no means an opportunity for selfish desires to rule" (158). That the body not be misused and set in opposition to Christ is already made evident in Phil 1,20: "Christ will be exalted now as always in my body". Because body and behavior in that body was of vital concern for Paul (cf. 1 Thess 4,1-8), the theme of body and belly are pivotal for understanding that Christ's suffering in the body as well as his glorious body are dual dimensions in which the believer participates (Phil 3,21). Participation in Christ's suffering as well as the eventual participation in his glorious body" are the fundamental motivating factors in the Apostle's instruction with regard to belly-worship.

In Rom 16,17-20, Paul refers to some Christians in Rome as "belly-worshippers" because they are, in reality, disguised servants of Satan. Philo's interpretation of Genesis 3 is used as the background for recognizing Paul's intention in these verses. Lifestyles that pursue the desires of the belly invoke the disapproval of the Apostle. This same concern is found elsewhere in Romans, especially in 1,24. Here again the immoral life of pagan society is viewed as a threat to the body of believers in whom the Holy Spirit dwells and

who are, therefore, God's temple. Those in Christ are expected to "put to death the deeds of the body..." (Rom 8,13).

Considerable attention is paid to 1 Corinthians. In 1 Cor 15,32, a key text, the Epicurean lifestyle is set in opposition to one grounded in the resurrection of Christ from the dead. "A life without hope of resurrection is marked by eating and drinking, characteristics of earthly existence. Faith in the future resurrection of the body makes the difference; true believers make use of their stomach according to this firm hope" (186). Since a resurrection perspective is put into question by the excessive behavior exhibited at the Lord's supper (1 Cor 11,17-34), the root cause of which is excessive eating and drinking. The criticism of a belly ideology is extended in 1 Corinthians 6 to include improper genital activity, a theme that is likely to be at the heart of 1 Cor 10,1-13 as well because the Greek verb παίζειν "is attested to an amorous meaning in Gen. 26:8 LXX" (199). Here as well Paul is arguing for the holiness of the body over against the Corinthian temptation to pollute the body.

The final chapter of the book reviews patristic literature and comes to the conclusion that this material confirms that Paul and the belly are understood primarily as "carnal gluttony" (262).

Sandnes' volume makes a number of important contributions not only to the two passages under discussion but to Pauline thought as a whole. Among the most important:

1. that the belly/stomach theme in Paul can only be understood in terms of the contemporary philosophical discussions on how to control the desires, particularly eating, drinking and sex;

2. that Paul's exhortations with regard to such behavior is rooted in his theology of the body which is shaped and informed by his faith in the resurrection. More specifically, participation in Christ serves as the bridge between the present and future transformed body. Since those in Christ are already in the process of transformation, their bodily conduct most correlate positively with their new life; and,

3. that Paul in using the term κοιλία is not polemizing against those who observe Jewish food regulations faithfully.

Belly and Body in the Pauline Epistles is, on the whole, more suggestive than definitive. Although I am sympathetic with the argument as a whole, some critical reflections are in order:

- a. Evocative is the partial development of a Pauline theology of the body, yet the various proposals are never brought together as a whole and developed in depth. There is a tendency to look at fragmented bits and pieces both within and outside of Paul; the coherent interrelationship of these various threads might have been woven together more consistently and with greater precision.

- b. The volume would have been considerably strengthened by deeper and more sustained analysis at a wide variety of points. 1. The patristic evidence is presented in such a cursory manner so as to be more connotative than persuasive. 2. In the analysis of Rom 16,17-20, a more comprehensive discussion of Philo in relationship to Gen 3,15 would have made the argument that Paul was referring to the serpent imagery more compelling. 4. For the exegesis of Rom 16,17-20 to have been convincing in the context of Pauline theology the textual problems of these verses would have required detailed

examination and evaluation. Certainly the question of Pauline authorship is not irrelevant to such a discussion. 5. The analysis of the Philippian opponents would have benefited from a more detailed analysis of the specific pagan cults in that city that might have exercised influence on the Philippian Christians. 6. References are made to 1 Thessalonians (eg., 168), but a sustained discussion of 1 Thess 4,1-8 is absent even though this section of 1 Thessalonians is directly related to a Pauline theology of the body.

Sandnes' *Belly and Body in the Pauline Epistles* is a volume filled with thoughtful proposals but its tendency toward generalization makes it more a prolegomenon than a definitive treatment of the Paul's theology of the body. Nevertheless, its great value lies in having opened up this topic in a broad, useful and provocative manner.

Smith College
Northampton, MA 01063, USA

Karl P. DONFRIED

Varia

Mark A. CHANCEY, *The Myth of a Gentile Galilee* (SNTSMS 118), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002, xv-229 p. 14,5 × 22,2. €45.00 – \$60.00

Los estudios sobre Galilea se multiplican sin cesar estos años. A los trabajos basados en los evangelios, Flavio Josefo y las fuentes rabínicas se suman los resultados de las excavaciones arqueológicas, que están en plena ebullición. Las opiniones están lejos de ser coincidentes. Hay quienes presentan una Galilea fuertemente helenizada, mientras otros insisten en su carácter radicalmente semítico; mientras algunos piensan que la urbanización ejercía una gran influencia, otros consideran que la región conservaba su carácter rural ancestral; las divergencias afectan también, aunque en menor medida, a la penetración del paganismo entre la población galilea. Una de las características de la prolífica investigación actual sobre el Jesús de la historia consiste precisamente en situarle respecto a la situación sociopolítica y religiosa de Galilea, hasta el punto de que se ha llegado a decir que la “tercera búsqueda” del Jesús histórico tiende a convertirse en la búsqueda de la Galilea de la historia (S. Freyne, “The Geography, Politics and Economics of Galilee”, *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evolutions of the State of Current Research* [eds. B. Chilton – C.A. Evans] [New Testament Tools and Studies 19; Leiden 1984] 76).

El libro que presentamos tiene un objetivo preciso y limitado: examinar el grado de penetración del paganismo en la población galilea del período romano primitivo (65 BCE - 135 CE). El autor deja claro que no debe

confundirse esta cuestión con otra que reconoce es clave: la penetración de la cultura grecorromana en Palestina. En cuanto al método, Chancey combina el examen de las fuentes literarias, fundamentalmente Flavio Josefo porque los textos rabínicos son posteriores, con las aportaciones más recientes de la arqueología. El libro está basado en una tesis doctoral, defendida en la universidad de Duke en 1999, y dirigida por E.P. Sanders y E.M. Meyers. Se trata de dos grandes especialistas, el primero conocido por sus trabajos sobre el judaísmo basado en textos, y el segundo un arqueólogo, que ha dirigido varias campañas en el sitio más interesante de Galilea, en Séforis. En algunas de estas campañas participó el mismo M.A. Chancey. Difícilmente podía encontrar el autor mejores tutores para los dos campos que pretende combinar en su obra.

El primer capítulo presenta las diversas opiniones que se han sostenido sobre la composición de la población galilea y que han solido depender de las ideas previas sobre la historia de la región. Con frecuencia se ha sostenido que era una población muy mezclada con un componente pagano muy grande. Es probablemente B.L. Mack quien últimamente ha defendido con más fuerza esta opinión como trasfondo de su teoría de una fuente Q galilea, poco judía y muy influida por los cínicos. La famosa obra de R.A. Batey (*Jesus and the Forgotten City: New Light on Sepphoris and the Urban World of Jesus* [Grand Rapids 1991]) que presenta una Galilea fuertemente helenizada y urbanizada se basa en datos de épocas posteriores. S. Freyne lleva muchos años trabajando sobre Galilea y enriqueciendo su visión sobre la región a la luz de los nuevos descubrimientos, pero ya en su primera obra, basada en fuentes literarias, defendió su carácter ininterrumpidamente judío (*Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian: 323 BCE to 135 CE: A Study of Second Temple Judaism* [Wilmington 1980, reimpr. 1998]). Chancey expone con gran claridad los argumentos esgrimidos para defender la presencia del paganismo en Galilea y que son objeto de análisis a lo largo del resto de la obra.

El segundo capítulo hace una historia de la población de Galilea. Tras la conquista asiria y consiguiente deportación, Galilea quedó muy poco habitada. En el período persa se observa un desplazamiento de los fenicios de la costa hacia el interior. Los tolomeos y seléucidas construyeron las ciudades de Tolemaida y Scitópolis en la frontera con Galilea, pero no parece que introdujeron población griega en su interior. Chancey tampoco considera que hubo una huida general de judíos durante las guerras de Jonatán y Simón (no concede valor histórico a 1Mac 5, 9-25). Un tema crucial para el tema del libro es el de la conquista de Galilea por Aristóbulo (103-104) y la obligación de convertirse al judaísmo de sus habitantes (AJ XIII, 318-319). El autor considera que este proceso no fue nada traumático, porque había judíos en Galilea y la población iturea, a la que se refiere Flavio Josefo, proveniente del norte, ya estaba circuncidada y era propicia a una alianza con los judíos. Algunos gentiles abandonaron Galilea, pero en compensación, en el período helenístico tardío y en el romano, nuevos colonizadores judíos se asentaron en la región. Herodes el Grande construyó templos al culto imperial en Sebaste, Cesarea Marítima y Paneas, pero no en Galilea, lo que indica el carácter judío de su población. Tampoco su hijo Antipas hizo templos paganos ni en Séforis ni en Tiberías. Cuando Galilea pasa a depender directamente de Roma (año

44) no se introdujeron ni tropas romanas ni nuevos colonizadores; los romanos se apoyaban en las élites locales. Al explicar las grandes rivalidades y diferentes actitudes que surgieron entre la población galilea en el momento de la guerra, Chancey elude explicar sus motivos y se limita a subrayar que en todo ello no influyó la división entre judíos y gentiles. Después del 70, sin que se puedan precisar exactamente las fechas, las tropas romanas, con todo su acompañamiento, se van haciendo presentes en Galilea, empezando por la ciudad de Séforis. Pero también, a partir de esta fecha y más aún después de 135, hay una considerable emigración de Judea a Galilea, que se convierte en el centro espiritual del judaísmo.

El tercer capítulo estudia las diversas localidades de la alta y baja Galilea durante los períodos helenístico tardío y romano primitivo. Concluye que la región muestra una fisionomía netamente judía, siendo imperceptible la presencia pagana. Va pasando revista a los diversos lugares y el estudio de Séforis resulta especialmente interesante. Reconoce que se trata de una ciudad romana de tipo medio que impide hablar de una Galilea totalmente rural. Pero la presencia de *miqvaot*, de vasijas de piedra (como requerían las normas de pureza judía) y las características de las monedas indica que su población era judía. Hay elementos helenísticos, pero que por sí solos no son expresión de paganismo. Se discute mucho la cronología del teatro de la ciudad, pero en cualquier caso no se han descubierto otros elementos típicos de las ciudades netamente paganas (templos, baños); las monedas de Antonino Pio (138-161) son, quizá, los primeros signos indudables de una presencia pagana en la ciudad. Chancey se inclina a admitir la existencia de una sinagoga en Cafarnaúm en el siglo I (debajo de las ruinas visibles que pertenecen a la del siglo V) e, incluso, en Tariquea/Magdala. En una de las pocas veces que el autor no acepta las conclusiones de los excavadores del lugar, no cree que se hayan encontrado en Betsaida los restos de un templo del culto imperial del siglo I y sorprende que no considere las monedas acuñadas en esta ciudad por Filipo con las imágenes del emperador y del templo de Paneas, que indican el carácter pagano de la mayoría de su población (J.J. Rousseau – R. Arav, *Jesus and his World. An Archeological and Cultural Dictionary* [London 1996] 61-68).

El cuarto capítulo, titulado “Galilee and the circle of nations”, comienza estudiando los territorios del entorno galileo (altos del Golán, Decápolis, Valle de Jezrael, Samaria) en los que predominan la población pagana, con la excepción de Gamala, netamente judía, famosa por su sinagoga del siglo I y su resistencia en la guerra judía y su destrucción por los romanos. Al hablar de Gadara se echa en falta la referencia a los varios filósofos cínicos procedentes de esta ciudad, que aparecen en textos que van desde el s. III AEC hasta el II CE, lo que ha llevado a algunos autores a hablar de la persistencia de la tradición cínica en esta ciudad (F.G. Downing, *Cynics and Christian Origins* [Edinburgh 1992] 147-148; G. Theissen, “Radicalismo itinerante. Aspectos literario-sociológicos de la tradición de las palabras de Jesús en el cristianismo primitivo”, en Idem, *Sociología del cristianismo primitivo* [Biblioteca de Estudios Bíblicos 51; Salamanca 1985] 24-25).

El estudio del contacto de los galileos con los extranjeros obliga, ante todo, a examinar las relaciones comerciales. La red interna de comunicaciones en Galilea era buena como se ve por la difusión por todas partes de la

cerámica de Kefar Hananyah y Shihim. La Via Maris, que conectaba Alejandría con Antioquía de Siria y discurría por la llanura costera, tenía dos ramales, uno que pasaba al norte del Lago y se dirigía a Damasco, y otro que iba a Scytopolis y empalmaba con la Via Real. Varias rutas atravesaban Galilea de este a oeste siguiendo los valles, una de las cuales unía Tolemaida con Tiberias con desviación a Séforis. El entorno del Lago estaba muy bien comunicado con Cesarea de Filipo y con la Decápolis. Sin embargo, Chancey afirma que no eran muchos los paganos que atravesaban Galilea, lo que no se concluye de los datos que él mismo aporta y contradice la opinión de autores muy solventes (S. Freyne, "Hellenistic/Roman Galilee", *ABD*, 2, 895-899). En cuanto a los contactos con paganos son indudables en las zonas fronterizas, como el entorno del lago respecto a la Decápolis, la alta Galilea y los altos del Golán, y las zonas cercanas a la franja costera. De una forma demasiado restrictiva, el autor piensa que aún en estos casos "nothing in the literary or archeological record suggests that such contact was especially frequent" (166).

El libro termina con unas páginas de conclusiones. Galilea era una región eminentemente judía con una pequeña minoría pagana. La expresión "Galilea de los gentiles" solo aparece en el TM en Is 8,23 y puede referirse a que en un tiempo histórico remoto Galilea era conocida como "distrito" de naciones o al hecho de estar rodeada de ciudades gentiles. Mt 4,15 usa este texto no para hablar de la Galilea de su tiempo, sino con la intención teológica de legitimar la apertura a los paganos. Chancey finaliza con algunas sugerencias sobre el Jesús histórico. Su ministerio se desarrolló casi siempre por la baja Galilea y, concretamente, en el entorno del lago, por lo que es muy verosímil que tuviese algún contacto con paganos. El centurión de Cafarnaún (Mt 8,5-13; Lc 7,1-10) no fue romano, porque estas tropas no estaban estacionadas en Galilea, y Antipas reclutaba extranjeros de diversa procedencia. No se puede excluir que Jesús, judío que se dirigía a los judíos, se acercase a las regiones de Tiro y de Cesarea de Filipo, donde vivían minorías judías importante. Pero el autor nada dice de las más que probables visitas a Betsaida, ciudad mayoritariamente pagana y de la que procedían algunos de sus más allegados seguidores. Es cierto que a la luz de los datos literarios y de las recientes excavaciones arqueológicas, no se puede hablar una Galilea desjudaizada y con fuerte presencia pagana, pero quizá Chancey minusvalora las relaciones de la región con los paganos, lo que no deja de ser importante a la hora de presentar "Jesus, the Jesus movement, and their Galilean context" (182).

Se trata de un libro claro, que proporciona una información arqueológica actualizada y muy útil, y que llega a unas conclusiones fundamentalmente convincentes que, por otra parte, están hoy muy aceptadas. La mayoría de los autores que hablan de una fuerte penetración de la cultura greco-romana en Galilea no quieren con ello decir que la región se paganizase. De un libro que hace tanto énfasis en el judaísmo de la población galilea se hubiese esperado que explicase las características propias de este judaísmo. El autor entiende el judaísmo galileo en el contexto del "common judaism", como lo describe su maestro E.P. Sanders (5, nota 18). ¿Pero no había diferencias regionales muy dignas de mención? ¿no se puede hablar de una judaísmo galileo peculiar, como piensan Vermes y otros autores? Si los conflictos que surgieron entre los galileos en el período romano primitivo no tuvieron relación con su

supuesto paganismo, ¿cuál fue, entonces, su causa? El punto candente de la investigación de Galilea está en las repercusiones que producía el proceso de urbanización, en la forma específica de control romano que se ejercía a través de los herodianos, y en las relaciones con el judaísmo jerosolimitano. El autor está magníficamente preparado para un próximo libro, que promete, sobre la helenización de Galilea, y en el cual tendría que abordar estos problemas.

Barraincúa, 16
E-48009 Bilbao

Rafael AGUIRRE

George W.E. NICKELSBURG, *1 Enoch 1. A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-36; 81-108*. Edited by Klaus Baltzer (Hermeneia). Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2001. xxxviii-618 p. 21,5 × 24. \$58.00

L'interesse per la cosiddetta letteratura apocrifa, o pseudepigrapha, ha conosciuto come è noto un crescendo, anche al di fuori dei circoli strettamente specialistici, fin dagli ultimi decenni del XVIII secolo. Il 1773, anno in cui James Bruce portò in Europa tre esemplari della versione etiopica del Libro di Enoc, segna il ritorno in Occidente di un testo che il Medioevo, sia bizantino sia latino, aveva come dimenticato. Nel mondo greco gli scritti enochici furono trasmessi almeno fino al IX secolo, come testimoniano le citazioni di Giorgio il Sincello; in quello latino l'eclissi risale ad un'epoca ancora più remota. Eppure durante i primi secoli dell'era cristiana, nonostante un acceso dibattito su autenticità e canonicità, questi testi furono molto letti e apprezzati; e ancor di più lo fu la figura del patriarca di cui essi rivendicano la paternità.

La riscoperta moderna ha avuto il merito non solo di portare alla luce nuovi testi o di dare contenuto a opere di cui si conosceva l'esistenza ma che sembravano perdute. Bensì ha permesso, attraverso uno studio approfondito seppure non scevro di ripensamenti, una comprensione rinnovata della storia di Israele e delle origini cristiane. Dietro ad alcuni di quei testi (quelli riconducibili alla tradizione enochica, appunto), un tempo annoverati tra gli scritti detti genericamente apocrifi, si è iniziato ad immaginare un movimento, o un gruppo, o una setta (si discute ancora sulla terminologia più appropriata); si sono ipotizzati legami tra questa tradizione e il resto del pensiero ebraico, che è così apparso sempre meno monolitico; si sono studiate le caratteristiche proprie e l'evoluzione di quel pensiero di cui i testi enochici erano espressione.

Per l'enoichismo in particolare, ma anche per gli altri testi apocrifi in generale, la scoperta dei testi di Qumran ha poi costituito un momento essenziale di articolazione, al punto da poter individuare agli inizi della seconda metà del XX secolo quasi una seconda rinascita dell'interesse per gli scritti enochici e apocrifi.

I contributi, studi o traduzioni, sono ormai numerosi. Si pensi all'opera di autori come M. Black, P.M. Bogaert, A. Caquot, J.D. Charles, J.H.

Charlesworth, J. Collins, M. Delcor, D. Dimant, F. García Martínez, J.C. Greenfield, P. Grelot, E. Isaac, M.A. Knibb, H.S. Kvanvig, J.T. Milik, P. Sacchi, M.E. Stone, D.W. Suter, E. Ullendorff, J.C. VanderKam, e tanti altri. Particolarmente significativa è in questo movimento di studio anche l'opera di Nickelsburg, costituita per lo più di articoli che prendono in considerazione diversi aspetti della tradizione enochica, sia da un punto di vista formale che contenutistico.

Tuttavia l'opera messa ora a disposizione degli studiosi, e qui presentata, costituisce indubbiamente un punto di arrivo e un nuovo punto di partenza per gli studi enochici. Ogni traduzione che si rispetti è in qualche modo anche un commento dell'opera tradotta; e noi disponiamo di un buon numero di traduzioni del cosiddetto pentateuco enochico. Ma la particolarità dell'opera di Nickelsburg è che qui siamo davanti non più a una traduzione annotata, bensì a un commentario alla maniera dei commentari biblici. Già l'opera di M. Black (*The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch*. A New English Edition [Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 7; Leiden 1985]) aveva operato questo spostamento di accento fornendo un primo commentario del pentateuco enochico. Nickelsburg completa l'itinerario, come dichiara esplicitamente sia nel sottotitolo (*A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch*) sia anche con la collocazione editoriale della sua opera nella collana *Hermeneia* della Fortress Press. Sarà forse solo un fatto formale, ma mi pare importante sottolineare questa collocazione che pone l'opera enochica ormai accanto agli altri libri «canonici» — libri che pure, per la loro particolare storia, conservano una preminenza nella comprensione del pensiero ebraico e cristiano — e ne afferma l'imprescindibile importanza (la medesima collana, forse a motivo della loro particolare importanza nel pensiero cristiano delle origini, ha accolto alcuni anni or sono anche un pregevole commento alle Lettere di Ignazio di Antiochia; cf. W.R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*. A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch [Hermeneia; Minneapolis 1985]).

Il testo qui recensito si presenta come la prima parte dell'opera programmata. Si limita infatti alla traduzione e al commento di tre libri del pentateuco enochico: il Libro dei Vigilanti, il Libro dei Sogni e l'Epistola di Enoc. Il Libro dell'Astronomia e il Libro delle Parabole sono annunciati per un prossimo volume, in collaborazione con VanderKam. Una lunga e articolata introduzione presenta il pentateuco nel suo insieme, soffermandosi sul problema della lingua di composizione, sul contenuto delle varie parti, sui manoscritti che attestano le differenti versioni, sulla composizione letteraria del pentateuco, sui temi salienti delle singole parti, sul contesto in cui si iscrive l'opera enochica e sui suoi echi nella letteratura successiva fino agli autori cristiani del IV secolo. Completano l'introduzione una breve presentazione degli studi più recenti e alcune riflessioni circa il futuro di tali studi. La seconda parte è costituita dal commentario vero e proprio: per ogni libro vi è un'introduzione particolare al testo, la traduzione, un apparato in cui si giustifica la traduzione ricorrendo alle lingue in cui ogni testo è tradito, e il commento. Concludono l'opera: un'ampia bibliografia; un indice comprendente i passi biblici, gli apocrifi (o pseudepigrafi), i testi di Qumran, la letteratura ebraica, la letteratura cristiana, altri testi; l'indice dei nomi; e infine una serie di excursus su temi di par-

ticolare interesse cui i testi si riferiscono.

Il valore del commento per la puntualità e per la massa di materiali di confronto accumulati è eccezionale. Non mi pare dunque il caso di soffermarsi su singoli punti della traduzione o del commento che potrebbero essere discussi. Prenderò invece in esame alcuni elementi dell'impostazione generale dell'opera di Nickelsburg e in particolare della storia della formazione dei testi enochici. Temi che mi paiono caratteristici dal punto di vista metodologico e allo stesso tempo meritevoli di approfondimenti.

Di fondamentale importanza è la questione dell'origine dei testi enochici e della loro distribuzione temporale, temi su cui mi pare di rilevare una certa incertezza nell'opera del Nickelsburg, dovuta forse anche al lungo arco di tempo in cui lo studioso ha concepito e redatto il commento in questione. Durante gli ultimi decenni, infatti, sono maturate nuove teorie che hanno completamente messo in crisi la precedente visione unitaria del pentateuco.

Nella sua introduzione, Nickelsburg, basandosi in particolare su un manoscritto enochico di origine qumranica (4Q204), prospetta l'ipotesi che una prima collezione di testi enochici, quelli appunto commentati in questo primo volume, sia stata composta come un «testamento», dal quale successivamente, con l'aggiunta di altri testi, è sorto il pentateuco attestato in etiopico. Dice l'autore: «The basic content and literary shape of 1 Enoch derive from a collection of writings that were structured as an Enochic testament» (23). A Qumran dunque non vi sarebbero dei semplici testi enochici, ma già una prima raccolta, caratterizzata come testamento, affermazione che non mi pare dimostrabile.

L'autore non mette in dubbio il carattere composito del nostro pentateuco etiopico (anche se lo distribuisce su un arco temporale che è probabilmente da allargare); infatti egli ne precisa la struttura individuando, accanto ai cinque libri principali, due appendici che concluderebbero l'opera (7). Ma la questione più delicata e interessante non è tanto la divisione di capitoli e versetti su cui troppo spesso ci si è intrattenuti, quanto piuttosto l'individuazione del momento storico e culturale in cui queste opere nate come scritti indipendenti, benché probabilmente espressioni di una medesima corrente di pensiero, sono state non semplicemente accostate l'una all'altra per ragioni di praticità nella trasmissione (come si farebbe di un corpus quale l'Antico Testamento o gli Apocrifi dell'Antico Testamento, o i testi di Qumran nelle edizioni moderne), ma «composte» in un'opera unitaria, provvista di un'unica numerazione di capitoli che rende ancora più chiaro l'intento. Ritorna insomma il problema se già a Qumran, nei frammenti aramaici, si possa parlare di pentateuco, e ritorna l'interrogativo sul ruolo del Libro dei Giganti, scomparso dal pentateuco etiopico, all'interno di questa presunta composizione unitaria. È vero che in alcuni manoscritti aramaici gli scritti enochici sono trasmessi uno accanto all'altro e che almeno in un manoscritto anche il Libro dei Giganti vi è associato, ma questo basta per dire che qui abbiamo già un «testamento» o addirittura un «pentateuco», o non siamo ancora piuttosto nel genere su evocato della raccolta di opere affini in un unico corpus? Uno dei manoscritti qumranici, il 4Q204, riporta uno accanto all'altro il Libro dei Vigilanti, il Libro dei Sogni, l'Epistola di Enoc e il Libro dei Giganti, ma a me pare che in

quel manoscritto non vi sia alcuna traccia di connessione tra i testi (numerazione o altro) e che si tratti di una semplice «raccolta» di testi affini e appartenenti a una medesima corrente di pensiero. Neppure nei frammenti greci, ammette l'autore (12-15), vi sono chiari segni di strutturazione in pentateuco, e tanto meno nelle troppo brevi citazioni siriane, copte e latine questo è verificabile. Anche qui allora dobbiamo accontentarci, rinunciando a ipotesi scarsamente documentabili, di ritenere la versione etiopica la prima versione che in maniera chiara ed inequivocabile attesta la struttura a pentateuco, con una numerazione progressiva dei capitoli dei vari libri.

Da ciò devono dipendere anche le considerazioni sull'origine dell'opera enochica, se si tratti di un altro pentateuco rispetto a quello mosaico o di un testamento, come suggerisce l'autore (21-25). Se di «nuovo pentateuco» si tratta, è dubbio che si possa collocare al livello dell'autore ebraico o aramaico, o quanto meno non mi pare dimostrabile. Certo Nickelsburg ha ragione nel ritenere la crisi il contesto in cui le «apocalissi» vengono alla luce; crisi in cui si fa spazio la ricerca di una dimensione ultraterrena dove quell'ordine violato nella realtà storica possa permanere inalterato. Ma forse è azzardato caratterizzare questa «crisi» come sfiducia verso la Legge di Mosè (per cui si giustificerebbe un altro pentateuco) e anche verso la profezia. Soprattutto perché i testi enochici nascono nell'arco di un periodo di tempo, quattro secoli almeno (l'autore tende a ridurre, datando il Libro dei Vigilanti alla metà del III secolo a.C. [7]), ma si vedano gli studi di P. Sacchi, in particolare: P. Sacchi, *L'apocalittica giudaica e la sua storia* [Biblioteca di cultura religiosa 55; Brescia 1990]), che non può essere ricondotto a un unitario momento di crisi.

Un ulteriore punto che mi pare meriti attenzione è quello del rapporto dei testi enochici con le opere qumraniche, e dei relativi movimenti o comunità. Quello della presenza o assenza di frammenti enochici a Qumran, dopo l'edizione di Milik (*The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* [Oxford 1976]), è uno dei problemi più dibattuti tra gli addetti ai lavori. In particolare per il Libro delle Parabole, quell'assenza è stata la «prova» principale, se non esclusiva, addotta da quanti hanno datato quel testo a dopo la chiusura delle grotte di Qumran, fino alla improbabilissima datazione di Milik al 270 d.C. Oggi tale ipotesi non è più condivisa e quell'assenza è spiegata altrimenti (ma il Libro delle Parabole sarà preso in considerazione nel secondo volume e quindi rimandiamo la discussione). Rimanendo ai testi i cui frammenti sono presenti a Qumran, si nota normalmente — e Nickelsburg conviene — che il loro numero lascia trapelare un interesse considerevole da parte dei qumraniani per la letteratura enochica. I manoscritti sono molti e, osserva Nickelsburg, anche ben distribuiti nel tempo (76); manca solo il Libro delle Parabole «composed outside» (77). Gli undici manoscritti contenenti materiale enochico sono certamente molti e confermano l'interesse su menzionato. Merita tuttavia maggior circospezione la seconda affermazione, riguardante la distribuzione temporale. Se infatti eccettuiamo un manoscritto riproducente il Libro dell'Astronomia — che per il suo contenuto e le sue applicazioni liturgiche possiamo considerare a se stante — e alcuni manoscritti del Libro dei Giganti, notiamo una totale assenza di copie di età erodiana e cristiana,

cioè corrispondenti alla seconda fase dell'insediamento di Khirbet Qumran. Questa osservazione aveva già portato Milik ad affermare che a partire dall'età erodiana vi è a Qumran un disinteresse per questa letteratura e che i testi vengono conservati ma non più ricopiati. Vi è stata probabilmente in questo periodo un'evoluzione interna alla comunità di Qumran per cui questi testi, che facevano parte delle radici ideologiche del gruppo, sono stati accantonati. Io spiego con questo «disinteresse» anche la mancanza a Qumran del Libro delle Parabole (S. Chialà, *Il Libro delle Parabole di Enoc*. Testo e commento [Studi Biblici 117; Brescia 1997] 54-64). Tale «disinteresse» è anche manifestato dal fatto che la figura stessa di Enoc, che nella letteratura cristiana avrà un ruolo importante, negli scritti propri della setta qumranica è quasi del tutto trascurata. Forse i qumranici possono essere discendenti del movimento enochico, ma certo nelle ultime fasi documentate non possono più dirsi «enochici» vista la scarsa rilevanza del patriarca negli scritti ad essi propri.

Il rapporto tra enochici e qumranici ci porta così a chiederci quale realtà sociologica possiamo immaginare dietro questi testi. L'autore ritiene di poter discernere «some textual evidence points in the direction of a community or group» (64). Essi avrebbero la coscienza di essere una comunità (64) anche se mancano riferimenti a luoghi concreti. L'autore vede un riferimento chiaro ad un luogo fisico nel Libro delle Parabole (46,8), dove si parla di coloro che perseguitano le «case dell'alleanza»; ma sappiamo bene quanto il termine «casa» sia impiegato in ambito semitico anche in senso figurato. Io direi che, dal confronto tra questi testi e quelli qumranici, emerge innanzitutto una distanza dal punto di vista della configurazione sociologica delle entità che li hanno prodotti. Si può ancora continuare a discutere sulla terminologia più appropriata, ma certo a Qumran siamo di fronte a un gruppo-setta-comunità che si concepisce come entità costituita e che condivide anche materialmente la propria esistenza al punto da concepire e scrivere una «regola» di vita comune. Nulla di tutto questo è invece ravvisabile nella letteratura enochica. Certo, dietro i testi enochici vi è un'entità sociologica che si riconosce in quelle idee e che quindi si «distingue» da altri soggetti pur appartenenti al medesimo mondo religioso-culturale, ma non vi è nessuna traccia nei testi giunti fino a noi che ci autorizzi a immaginare qualcosa che possa andare al di là di un movimento, e di un movimento in evoluzione. Tutto sommato, anche in questo vi è una differenza importante tra la comunità di Qumran e gli enochici; nel primo caso abbiamo a che fare con un'entità che, certo, ha conosciuto anche un'evoluzione interna, propria a ogni realtà comunitaria viva, ma in cui la forte caratterizzazione ideologica, per quello che possiamo valutare dai cosiddetti scritti propri della comunità, ha garantito una maggiore coesione; nel secondo invece non abbiamo nient'altro che un movimento o corrente di pensiero.

Una sezione particolarmente pregevole dell'ampia introduzione è, infine, quella relativa alla fortuna di Enoc nella letteratura successiva. L'autore passa in rassegna la letteratura giudaica e cristiana, offrendo un'ottima sintesi in merito, che potrebbe essere arricchita forse solo da un'analisi della letteratura siriana che mi pare trascurata. Mi limito quindi solo ad alcune osservazioni, che possono apparire come dei limiti dell'indagine, ma

che nulla tolgono al pregio della sezione. Un primo rilievo è di tipo metodologico: sarebbe forse stato utile distinguere, all'interno dei riferimenti rilevati, quelli che sono riferimenti certi (impliciti o espliciti) all'opera enochica da quelli che invece si riferiscono al tema specifico della caduta angelica. La distinzione mi pare utile perché a un certo punto il tema della caduta angelica sembra essere diventato una sorta di concetto di cui forse gli immediati fruitori ignoravano l'origine enochica. Un secondo rilievo riguarda la fortuna del personaggio Enoc soprattutto nel mondo cristiano, che è da distinguere dalla fortuna dell'opera a lui attribuita. Ciò sarebbe particolarmente evidente qualora analizzassimo i secoli IV-V d.C. quando, di fronte alla «crisi» degli scritti enochici, non più accettati come autorevoli dalla maggior parte delle comunità cristiane, la figura di Enoc mantiene un ruolo centrale nell'escatologia cristiana, essendo egli atteso insieme ad Elia alla fine dei tempi. Infine, ancora nell'ambito della ricezione dell'opera enochica, si deve rilevare un'assenza: il Figlio dell'uomo di cui parla il Libro delle Parabole, centrale ancora nella tradizione neotestamentaria, è quasi del tutto trascurato nella tradizione successiva sia giudaica sia cristiana. In quest'ultima esso è invocato solo per affermare la natura umana di Gesù, quindi in un senso completamente diverso rispetto a quello che il titolo intendeva significare nella tradizione precedente fino al Nuovo Testamento incluso.

Nell'ambito della ricezione, poi, come rileva l'autore stesso, un luogo a parte spetta alla tradizione etiopica, dove il pentateuco enochico si è conservato nella forma più ampia a noi pervenuta. Ma anche qui è forse necessaria una precisazione. Nickelsburg, e con lui altri, parlano spesso di «canonicità» degli scritti enochici in ambito etiopico (104; 108). Forse la terminologia non è adeguata. Quello che possiamo dire è che i testi enochici sono molto letti e spesso ricopiati insieme ai testi che compongono l'Antico e il Nuovo Testamento, alla stregua di altri testi anch'essi non canonici per il resto delle chiese cristiane, come il Pastore di Erma. Sarebbe dunque forse più corretto dire che questi testi sono «autorevoli» all'interno della tradizione etiopica, senza impiegare una categoria — quella della canonicità — che rischia di essere inadeguata (si veda in proposito lo studio di R.W. Cawley, "The Biblical Canon of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church today", *OstKSt* 23 [1974] 318-323).

Un'ulteriore questione che merita attenzione è di carattere piuttosto metodologico e riguarda il testo tradotto e annotato. È noto che il pentateuco enochico nella sua interezza è tradito solo in etiopico. Vi sono poi importanti frammenti in greco e in aramaico, e alcune citazioni in siriano, coperto e latino. L'autore annuncia fin dalla prima pagina della sua prefazione che la lingua originale dei testi in questione sia l'aramaico, e che l'etiopico sia la versione della traduzione greca, a sua volta realizzata a partire dall'aramaico (xxiii). L'idea è ribadita anche all'inizio dell'introduzione (1) e precisata e circostanziata qualche pagina oltre (9). La questione della lingua originale dell'opera enochica è ancora disputata e varie permangono le ipotesi; si registrano variazioni tra i sostenitori dell'originale aramaico e quelli dell'originale ebraico, l'uno e l'altro poi mediato o meno da una versione greca. Per il Libro delle Parabole ci sarà anche chi, come Milik, proporrà una composizione, assolutamente improbabile a mio avviso, in

greco. L'analisi attenta dei dati offerti dal confronto delle versioni mi pare confermarci sull'originale ebraico o aramaico e sull'intermediazione di una versione greca tra il testo originale e l'etiopico; quanto però a scegliere tra ebraico ed aramaico, mi sembra che gli argomenti addotti siano ancora insufficienti. Solo, per le parti del pentateuco enochico attestate dai frammenti qumranici (vale a dire tutte ad eccezione del Libro delle Parabole), il rinvenimento di tali frammenti potrebbe far propendere per l'originale aramaico. È questo infatti l'argomento che pare orientare anche la posizione dell'autore che ritiene «*virtually certain*» che l'aramaico sia la lingua originale del Libro dei Vigilanti, del Libro dei Giganti e dei capitoli 72-107 (9), benché lasci come possibile l'ipotesi che l'autore di quei testi abbia utilizzato fonti ebraiche. Incerto resta invece sulla lingua originale del Libro delle Parabole e del capitolo 108. Se è condivisibile la posizione relativa a queste ultime due parti, desta quanto meno perplessità la certezza circa l'originale aramaico per il resto del pentateuco. Il rinvenimento dei frammenti aramaici rischia di essere sopravvalutato; non mancano infatti esempi di testi — il Libro delle Parabole, ad esempio, tradito solo in etiopico e che non può dirsi composto in questa lingua — giunti a noi in versioni certamente non originali. La via più sicura da percorrere in questo campo resta forse ancora quella del confronto linguistico e sintattico, già da tempo intrapresa da P. Piovanelli (a torto non considerato dal nostro autore; cf. in particolare P. Piovanelli, "Sulla *Vorlage* aramaica dell'Enoch etiopico", *SCO* [1987] 545-595), che purtroppo però solo di rado riesce a dare frutti certi quando la disputa è tra due lingue così prossime tra loro come l'ebraico e l'aramaico.

Muovendo dalla convinzione che il testo originale sia in aramaico, l'autore sceglie poi per la sua traduzione di «costruire» un testo che egli stesso chiama «*eclectic text*» (3) in cui predilige i frammenti aramaici; in seconda istanza quelli greci; e, solo per le parti mancanti, si basa sul testo etiopico, confrontandolo anche con le citazioni siriane, copte e latine (i criteri che regolano le precedenze nell'uso dei testi sono esposti a pagina 20). L'autore è cosciente — e lo dichiara esplicitamente — che in tal modo produce «*a text that nowhere existed*» (4), ma è tuttavia convinto che questa sia la «*oldest form of the text at any given point*» (3). Anche qui mi pare che l'intento — lodevole — di avvicinarsi al testo più antico a noi oggi accessibile, rischi di allontanarci da qualsiasi oggettività testuale e forma «storica» del testo stesso. L'autore pare presupporre, forse implicitamente, che il testo etiopico a noi giunto (in quale forma manoscritta poi non è molto chiaro) sia la traduzione del greco a noi giunto, e che quest'ultimo sia traduzione dell'aramaico ritrovato a Qumran. Ma il confronto con altri testi della medesima area — si pensi a quello che le scoperte qumraniche hanno provocato a livello di ripensamento circa il rapporto tra la LXX e il TM dell'Antico Testamento — ci spinge a una meditata prudenza in questo campo. Sarebbe preferibile continuare ad attenersi al testo più completo giunto fino a noi, riferendo puntualmente in nota le varianti di quelle versioni che certo hanno buona probabilità di trasmettere un testo più antico, ma che purtroppo restano per ora frammentarie. Questa prudenza è inoltre imposta dal fatto che neppure il testo etiopico di cui disponiamo può dirsi ancora un testo sicuro. Lo stesso autore fa un passo

avanti rispetto all'ultima edizione del testo etiopico ad opera del Knibb, in collaborazione con Ullendorff (*The Ethiopic Book of Enoch. A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, [Oxford 1978]), che si era limitato a riprodurre un manoscritto e in apparato le varianti più significative, ma che aveva rinunciato a qualsiasi scelta. Nickelsburg, a ragione, rischia la scelta all'interno delle varianti e propone implicitamente una nuova edizione critica. Di fatto, dopo le edizioni di Dillmann (1851), di Flemming (1902) e di Charles (1906), che disponevano di un numero di manoscritti sensibilmente inferiore a quelli oggi noti, non ci sono state altre edizioni che hanno tentato almeno di ricostruire un testo che si avvicinasse a quello più antico, secondo il metodo della spesso denigrata — ma francamente ancora non superata — tradizionale edizione critica. Una nuova edizione critica, nel senso tradizionale del termine, sarebbe auspicabile, come ricorda l'autore stesso a conclusione della sua introduzione (125).

Il pregio più grande del libro in questione è certamente l'ampio e documentato commentario. La mole è tale da rendere inopportuno qualsiasi tentativo di analisi puntuale. Di più, mi pare che all'apprezzamento per il decennale lavoro di ricerca qui confluito si potrebbero anche far seguire alcune note critiche su alcune scelte relative al testo accolto o alla traduzione proposta, ma ritengo che non sia questo il modo di rendere conto di un lavoro di questa mole che resta una pietra miliare nello studio della tradizione enochica. Concludo dunque aggiungendo ai rilievi già fatti, solo due osservazioni: una di carattere semantico e una di tipo metodologico. La prima riguarda una semplice questione di vocabolario: per secoli gli studiosi di letteratura enochica hanno impiegato il sostantivo «apocalittica» e l'aggettivo relativo «apocalittico», ma oggi ci rendiamo sempre più conto, nonostante le precisazioni fatte e ribadite, del limite di questa terminologia; Nickelsburg giunge fino a parlare di «apocalyptic religion» (5); la mia considerazione è la seguente: non si potrebbe abbandonare questa dicitura e parlare semplicemente di «letteratura enochica», ovviamente per quei testi che a tale corrente di pensiero si possono ricondurre? La seconda considerazione è invece relativa a un tema che affiora spesso all'interno del libro e che mi pare possa essere — soprattutto per chi non è particolarmente addentro alle questioni trattate — un elemento di confusione: molto spesso, soprattutto trattando della ricezione della tradizione enochica nella letteratura successiva, l'autore si riferisce al tema del Figlio dell'uomo la cui ricorrenza egli considera un segno della fortuna della tradizione enochica; visto però che il tema del Figlio dell'uomo ricorre esclusivamente nel Libro delle Parabole, che è cronologicamente posteriore ai testi enochici qui commentati e che sarà oggetto del secondo volume, sarebbe stato forse più corretto distinguere i due itinerari per caratterizzare meglio la permanenza dei vari temi enochici lungo i secoli. La trattazione separata di questo tema, così importante anche per comprendere l'articolazione tra letteratura enochica e Nuovo Testamento, avrebbe forse anche favorito un'analisi più esauriente del confronto tra questi due ambiti; avrebbe permesso ad esempio di mettere meglio in luce anche i punti di discontinuità, e non solo quelli di continuità, tra le due tradizioni, non ultimo il tema della sofferenza del Figlio dell'uomo di cui parla il Nuovo Testamento e che è invece assoluta-

mente assente dal Libro delle Parabole. Forse anche questa anticipazione del tema del Figlio dell'uomo risente di quella visione un po' troppo unitaria dell'opera enochica di cui si diceva.

A conclusione della sua introduzione, l'autore afferma: «This commentary is only the beginning of a major task» (125). L'inizio è notevole e promettente in vista di una rivisitazione dell'intera tradizione enochica, che possa così entrare in un dialogo sempre più profondo con le «altre letterature» giudaiche e cristiane coeve e successive. Davanti a imprese di questo tenore non si può che essere grati.

Comunità di Bose
I-13887 Magnano (BI)

Sabino CHIALÀ

NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

Pontificium Institutum Biblicum Annus academicus 2003-2004. I semestre

Auditores inscripti erant 351, qui in diversas categorias sic distribuebantur:

	Ad Doctoratum	Ad Licentiam	Hospites	Universi
Fac. Biblica	22	290	22	334
Fac. Orientalistica	—	3	14	17
Universi	22	293	36	351
Nationes	73	Alumni	351	
Dioceses	166	Alumni	182	
Inst. Religiosorum	49	Alumni	120	
Inst. Religiosarum	16	Alumnae	17	
Ex statu laicali	32	Alumnae	20	
		Alumni	12	

Laureae

Laureae in Re Biblica digni declarati sunt:

SANCHEZ NAVARRO Luis (28.10.2003). «*Venid a mí*». *El discipulado, comunión con Jesús y fuente de descanso, fundamento de la ética en Mateo (Mt 11,28-30 y textos relacionados)* (magna cum laude). Moderator: STOCK Klemens.

OBIORAH Mary Jerome (16.12.2003). «*How Lovely Is Your Dwelling Place*»: *The Desire for God's House in Psalm 84* (cum laude). Moderator: ALTHANN Robert.

Doctores in Re Biblica renuntiati sunt, typis edita thesi:

AGUILAR CHIU José Enrique, *La justificación y el Espíritu en Pablo* (Peter Lang, Bern 2003).

GIUNTOLI Federico, *L'officina della Tradizione. Studio di alcuni interventi redazionali post-sacerdotali e del loro contesto nel ciclo di Giacobbe (Gn 25,19–50,26)* (AnBib 154; PIB Roma 2003).

Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense
at the Catholic University of Leuven
July 27-29, 2004

The 53rd *Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense* will take place on 27-29 July 2004 at the Catholic University of Leuven (Belgium). The topic is "The Septuagint and Messianism". Offers for short papers (20 min.) can be submitted before March 15, 2004 to the president of the 2004 Colloquium:

Prof. Dr. Michael A. Knibb
6 Shootersway Park
Berkhamsted
Herts. HP4 3NX
U.K.
e-mail: michael.knibb@britishlibrary.net

For further information please see www.theo.kuleuven.ac.be/en/congresses.htm or contact the secretary:

Prof. Dr. Joseph Verheyden
Catholic University Leuven
St-Michielsstraat 6
B-3000 Leuven
e-mail: jos.verheyden@theo.kuleuven.ac.be

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

En este Elenco aparecen todos los libros enviados a *Biblica*, de alguna manera relacionados con los estudios bíblicos. La mención de un título en este Elenco no implica por tanto juicio acerca de la obra. El consejo de dirección determina qué libros serán recensionados en *Biblica*.

Los libros y fascículos que non han sido expresamente pedidos por *Biblica* no serán devueltos al remitente, aún cuando no parezca conveniente publicar una recensión sobre ellos.

Todos los libros y fascículos enviados a *Biblica* se trasmiten al Editor del *Elenchus of Biblica*, y aparecen en él a juicio de dicho Editor.

Envíense los libros a: Dirección *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, via della Pilotta, 25 I-00187 Roma, Italia.

Auvinen, Ville, *Jesus' Teaching on Prayer*. Åbo, Åbo Akademis Förlag, 2003. 311 p. 14,4 × 21

Bailey, Randall C., *Yet with a Steady Beat*. Contemporary U. S. Afrocentric Biblical Interpretation (Semeia Studies 42). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2003. vii-200 p. 15 × 23. \$27.95

Bauer, David R., *An Annotated Guide to Biblical Resources for Ministry*. Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 2003. viii-327 p. 16,5 × 22,5

Bautch, Kelley Coblentz, *A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17-19*. "No One Has Seen What I Have Seen" (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 81). Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2003. xvii-332 p. 16,5 × 24

Ben-Daniel, John – **Ben-Daniel**, Gloria, *The Apocalypse in the Light of the Temple*. A New Approach to the Book of Revelation. Jerusalem, Beit Ben Yochanan, 2003. x-266 p. 14,5 × 22,5. €14.00

Betori, Giuseppe, *Affidati alla Parola*. Ricerche sull'Opera di Luca (Supplementi alla Rivista Biblica 42). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 2003. 304 p. 17 × 24. €29,50

Bittasi, Stefano, *Gli esempi necessari per discernere*. Il significato argomentativo della struttura della lettera di Paolo ai Filipesi (AnBib 153). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2003. x-274 p. 16,5 × 24. €18.00

Bordeyne, Philippe (sous la direction de), *Bible et Morale* (LD hors série). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2003. 220 p. 13,5 × 21,5. €22.00

Borowski, Oded, *Daily Life in Biblical Times* (Archaeology and Biblical Studies 5). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2003. xi-148 p. 15 × 23. \$15.95

Botterweck, G. Joannes – **Rinngren**, Helmer (a cura di), *Grande Lessico dell'Antico Testamento*. Volume III: יִרְקָח־חֹמֶר. Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 2003. xv-563 p. 18 × 25. €109,50

Brown, Raymond E., S.S., *An Introduction to the Gospel of John*. Edited, updated, introduced, and concluded by Francis J. Moloney, S. D. B. (The Anchor Bible Reference Library). New York, Doubleday, 2003. xxvi-356 p. 16 × 24. \$30.00

Cavalcoli, Giovanni, *Il mistero dell'incarnazione del Verbo* (Sacra Doctrina Monografie). Bologna, Edizioni Studio Domenicano, 2003. 424 p. 15 × 21. €16.00

Cazeaux, Jacques, *Histoire, utopie, mystique. Ouvrir la Bible comme un livre* (Initiations bibliques). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2003. 244 p. 13,5 × 21,5. €29.00

Chapa, Juan (ed.), *Signum et testimonium*. Estudios en honor del Prof. Antonio García Moreno en su 70 cumpleaños. Pamplona, Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, S. A., 2003. 340 p. 16 × 23,5

Clowney, Edmund P., *Preaching Christ in All of Scripture*. Wheaton, IL, Crossway Books, 2003. 189 p. 14 × 21,5. \$15.99

Collado Bertomeu, Vicente (ed.), *Palabra, prodigio, poesía*. In Memoriam P. Luis Alonso Schökel, S.J. (AnBib 151, Huerto de Enseñanzas 1). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico – Jávea (Alicante), Huerto de Enseñanzas, 2003. 378 p. 16,5 × 24. €27.00

Cook, Stephen L., *The Apocalyptic Literature* (Interpreting Biblical Texts). Nashville, Abingdon Press, 2003. 233 p. 15 × 23. \$19.00 – Can\$31.99 – €13.99

Crawford, Sidnie White – **Greenspoon**, Leonard J. (eds.), *The Book of Esther in Modern Research* (JSOTSS 380). London – New York, T & T Clark International, 2003. xii-266 p. 16 × 24. €70.00

D'Amico, José Luis – **de la Serna**, Eduardo (coordinadores), “*Donde está el Espíritu, está la libertad*”. Homenaje a Luis Heriberto Rivas con motivo de sus 70 años. Buenos Aires, Editorial San Benito, 2003. 447 p. 16,5 × 23

De Jonge, M., *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature*. The Case of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Greek Life of Adam and Eve (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 18). Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2003. viii-281. 16,5 × 24

de Mingo Kaminouchi, Alberto, ‘*But it is not so Among You*’. Echoes of Power in Mark 10.32-45 (JSNTSS 249). London – New York, T & T Clark International, 2003. ix-244 p. 16 × 24. €65.00

Donaldson, Amy – **Sailors**, Timothy B. (eds.), *New Testament Greek and Exegesis*. Essays in Honor of Gerald F. Hawthorne. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U.K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003. xiv-262 p. 15,5 × 23,5. \$50.00 – €35.00

Dupuy, Michel et al., *Marie, fille d'Israël, fille de Sion* (Études Mariales). Paris, Médiaspaul, 2003. 255 p. 15,5 × 22. €35.00

Eckstein, Hans-Joachim, *Der aus Glauben Gerechte wird leben*. Beiträge zur Theologie des Neuen Testaments (Beiträge zum Verstehen der Bibel 5). Münster, LIT Verlag, 2003. xi-276 p. 16 × 23,5. €20,90

Fassnacht, Martin – **Leinhaupt-Wilke**, Andreas – **Lücking**, Stephan (Hrsg.), *Die Weisheit – Ursprung und Rezeption*. Festschrift für Karl Löning zum 65. Geburtstag (NTAbh 44). Münster, Aschendorff, 2003. 380 p. 16 × 24. €55.00

Fewell, Dana Nolan, *The Children of Israel*. Reading the Bible for the sake of Our Children. Nashville, Abingdon Press, 2003. 243 p. 15 × 23. \$26.00 – Can\$42.99 – €18.99

Fokkelman, J. P., *The Psalms in Form*. The Hebrew Psalter in its Poetic Shape. Leiden, Deo Publishing, 2002. 172 p. 21,5 × 30. €29.95

Furuli, Rolf, *Assyrian, Babylonian, Egyptian and Persian Chronology Compared with the Chronology of the Bible: Volume I: Persian Chronology and the Length of the Babylonian Exile of the Jews*. Oslo, R. Furuli AS, 2003. 251 p. 15 × 21,5

Gaines, Janet Howe, *Forgiveness in a Wounded World*. Jonah's Dilemma (Studies in Biblical Literature 5). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2003. ix-179 p. 15 × 23. \$26.95

Gaventa, Beverly Roberts, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Abingdon New Testament Commentaries). Nashville, Abingdon Press, 2003. 392 p. 15 × 23. \$28.00 – €19.99 – Can\$45.99

Giuntoli, Federico, *L'officina della tradizione*. Studio di alcuni interventi redazionali post-sacerdotali e del loro contesto nel ciclo di Giacobbe (Gn 25,19 – 50,26) (AnBib 154). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2003. 447 p. 16,5 × 24. €26.00

Gonen, Rivka, *Contested Holiness*. Jewish, Muslim, and Christian Perspectives on the Temple Mount in Jerusalem. Jersey City, KTAV Publishing House, 2003. xiv-206 p. 21 × 27,5. Hardcover: \$29.50; paperback: \$19.95

González Salinero, Raúl., *Biblia y polémica antijudía en Jerónimo* (Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» de la Biblia Políglota Matritense 70). Madrid, Instituto de Filología del CSIC, 2003. 294 p. 17 × 23

Graffy, Adrian, *Alive and Active*. The Old Testament Beyond 2000. Blackrock, The Columba Press, 1999. 192 p. 13,5 × 21,5

Hooker Morna D., *Not in the Word Alone*. The First Epistle to the Thessalonians. (Monographic Series of «Benedictina» 15). Rome, «Benedictina» Publishing, 2003. 194 p. 17 × 23,5

Keerankeri, George, *The Love Commandment in Mark*. An Exegetico-Theological Study of Mk 12,28-34 (AnBib 150). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2003. 278 p. 16,5 × 24. €18.00

Kerber, Daniel, *“No me eligieron ustedes a mí, sino que yo los elegí a ustedes”*. Estudio exegetico-teológico sobre el verbo ἐκλεγομαι en el cuarto evangelio. Montevideo, Facultad de Teología de Uruguay, 2003. 246 p. 16 × 22

Kessler, Martin, *Battle of the Gods: the God of Israel versus Marduk of Babylon*. A Literary/Theological Interpretation of Jeremiah 50-51 (Studia Semitica Neerlandica 42). Assen, Royal Van Gorcum, 2003. x-259 p. 16 × 24. €69.50

Kitzberger, Ingrid Rosa, *Autobiographical Biblical Criticism*. Between Text and Self. Leiden, Deo Publishing, 2002. xii-209 p. 15,5 × 24,5. €24.95

Klauck, Hans-Josef, *Magic and Paganism in Early Christianity*. The World of the Acts of the Apostles. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2003. xii-136 p. 14 × 21. \$15.00

Klutz, Tod E. (ed.), *Magic in the Biblical World*. From the Rod of Aaron to the Ring of Solomon (JSNTSS 245). London – New York, T & T Clark International, 2003. xv-261 p. 16 × 21. €65.00

Korpel, Marjo – **Oesch**, Josef (eds.), *Unit Delimitation in Biblical Hebrew and Northwest Semitic Literature* (Pericope 4). Assen, Koninklijke Van Gorcum, 2003. vii-320 p. 16 × 24,5. €70.00

La Gioia, Fabio, *La glorificazione di Gesù Cristo ad opera dei discepoli*. Analisi biblico-teologica di Gv 17,10b nell'insieme dei capp. 13-17 (Tesi Gregoriana 101). Roma, Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2003. 339 p. 17 × 24. €21.00

Lapham, F., *An Introduction to the New Testament Apocrypha*. London – New York, T & T Clark International, 2003. ix-193 p. 15,5 × 23,5. Hardback: €70.00; paperback: €14.99

Lee, John A. L., *A History of New Testament Lexicography* (Studies in Biblical Greek 8). New York, Peter Lang, 2003. xiv-414 p. 15,5 × 23. \$39.95

Lemaire, André, *Naissance du monothéisme*. Point de vue d'un historien (Domaine biblique). Paris, Bayard, 2003. 194 p. 15 × 20,5. €18.00

Liverani, Mario, *Oltre la Bibbia* (Storie e Società). Roma – Bari, Editori Laterza, 2003. xv-510 p. 14 × 21. €24.00

Lohse, Eduard (übersetzt und erklärt von), *Der Brief an die Römer* (MeyerK 4). 15. Auflage. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003. 423 p. 17 × 25. €59.00

Lorein, G. W., *The Antichrist Theme in the Intertestamental Period* (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 44). London – New York, T & T Clark International, 2003. xii-283 p. 16 × 24. €75.00

Lupo, Angela Maria, CP, *La Sete, l'Acqua, lo Spirito*. Studio esegetico e teologico sulla connessione dei termini negli scritti giovannei (Analecta Gregoriana 289). Roma, Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2003. 468 p. 16,5 × 23. €32.00

Macarios de Magnésie, *Le Monogénès*. Tome I: Introduction générale; Tome II: Édition critique, traduction et commentaire (Textes et Traditions). Édition critique et traduction française par Richard Goulet. Paris, Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 2003. 383 p. (Tome I), vii-445 p. (Tome II). 16 × 24. €80.00

Mason, Steve, *Josephus and the New Testament*. Second Edition. Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 2003. xviii-318 p. 14 × 21,5

ISSN 0006-0887

This periodical is indexed in the ATLA Religion Database, published by the American Theological Library Association, 250 S. Wacker Dr., 16th Flr., Chicago, IL 60606.

E-mail: atla@atla.com. <http://www.atla.com/>

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa



Associato all'Unione Stampa Periodica Italiana

Finito di stampare il 16 febbraio 2004

Tip.: Ist. Salesiano Pio XI - Via Umbertide, 11 - 00181 Roma